

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXV.

JULY, 1855.

ARTICLE I.

JUS ECCLESIASTICUM—THE MARYLAND SYNOD'S QUESTION.

By Rev. J. A. Sciss, A. M., Baltimore.

GOVERNMENT is an essential requisite in all society. There can be no being without law, and no social being without something to control social relations. Man was made a social creature. Society is one of the necessary conditions of his being. Political authority, then, or something to regulate his social life, is an indispensable concomitant of his existence. Without government there can be no order, no peace could live, and we would be, at best, like so many detached wheels from the great machinery of being, all thrown together in a disordered pile, of no service to each other, and none to our Maker.

And as God has thus shaped man for society, and laid in the very framework of his nature, this necessity for government, we may rest assured that he has not left it to be supplied by mere human discretion. Writers on Law sometimes talk as if God, in his institutions for the good of man, had had no reference to political interests, or had left them to be discovered, defined and regulated by the wit and wisdom of earth. Such a doctrine dishonors the Creator, as much as it contradicts revelation and fact. The outward configurations of political power, may be, in part, discretionary with men; but, whatever philosophers and jurists may tell us about natural rights,

voluntary surrenders, and social compacts, that power comes, not from mutual human consent, but from God, who also claims its control. "The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations." "There is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God." "Who-soever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." And whosoever attempts the exercise of power contrary to the Divine will, as expressed in our nature, or delivered to us in revelation, is an usurper and a tyrant.

Now, if this be true of political authority, certainly no less can be said of ecclesiastical power. If God is the author and governor of the state, he is much more directly the author and governor of the church. The church is preëminently his kingdom, and we are not to suppose that he has left its constitution and government to the invention and will of man. He surely would not claim control of the administrations of the secular world, and yet relinquish those of his own peculiar household to the caprices of erring mortals. And when we consider how infirm and short-sighted the best men are, and how hard it is for them, even with the aid of ample Divine directions, to manage their own families with prudence, it is absurd to think that God has left the polity of his church, which is a thing so vital to it, to be framed, ordered, and administered as men may list. Christ Jesus is also announced in the Scriptures as Lord, King, Master, Rabboni, Bishop, Apostle, and High Priest of the church; which shows the existence of his own direct and high sovereignty in it—a sovereignty with which no created hand may meddle—and which all, on pain of eternal death, are bound to obey, though in disobedience to all earthly sovereigns. "God hath committed all judgment to the Son, and hath put all things under his feet, and hath given him to be Head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

As the church, then, is preëminently God's kingdom, its government is eminently God's government. He has there set up an empire "not of this world," all the essential agencies, dependencies, and administrations of which, proceed directly from himself, and can have no binding power except from him. And whatever subverts, voids, or contradicts the laws, appointments, or regulations which he has ordained, is nugatory and wicked. No human power can revise, amend, or nullify his institutes. Obedience to him is the only thing obligatory, and invests with a standing in his kingdom, and guarantees to a man all his ecclesiastical rights, in defiance of

all the Synods, bishops, patriarchs, conclaves, popes, and grandees of ecclesiastical office, that the vanity, or the pusillanimity, or the wisdom of mortals has ever set up in christendom. Tyranny may crush such a man, and a false and perverted public opinion may drive him into exile; but morally, and in the sight of God, and therefore *really*, he continues in the rights of a heavenly citizenship, of which neither saints, nor sinners, nor angels, nor devils, can deprive him.

The church of Jesus Christ is a *supernatural society*. It is a special institution of the Lord himself. It is an assembly called of God, by his own direct and miraculous intervention. It took its origin and form from the incarnation and personal ministry of the Son of God, and the labors of his inspired servants. It can therefore have no essential laws, but such as are equally supernatural with itself. The history of that incarnation and ministry, and of the labors and teachings of Jesus, and those whom he commissioned and inspired, must contain the church's constitution, and the charter for all that dare be claimed or enforced as necessary in any of its administrations. Mere man might as well think of drafting a constitution for the hierarchies of heaven, as for God's church. It is an institution hardly less wonderful than the celestial principdoms. When the Savior instituted it, it opened out before him as a vast and mighty community, spread over the whole earth, commensurate with all time, embracing all lands, languages, and nations—all ranks, degrees, and varieties of men, from the lowest up to the mightiest spirits and giant intellects of humanity. Well has it been said, that if a council of the heavens had been called, and Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel, and all the sons of light and celestial fire been convened to deliberate for an age, they could not have made a constitution for this church, or sketched a system to have united, cemented, coalesced, and harmonized such a society as this. Such a work belonged only to the Father of Lights, and to that Architect and Lawgiver who framed creation, and marked the circuits of the worlds. Even Hooker, bent, as he was, upon defending the establishment of England against the Puritans, was forced to concede, that "as the church is a society supernatural, the bond of its association must be a law supernatural, which God himself hath revealed. The substance of the service of God, therefore, may not be invented of men, as it is among the heathens, but must be received from God himself, as always it hath been in the church, saving only when the church hath been forgetful of her duty."—(I. 15, 3.) The prudential regulations of human expediency, whenever they conflict with the precepts

of inspiration, must therefore be resisted. The Holy Scriptures are the only authoritative directory of the church, whether in doctrine or discipline, faith or government. "We may not give ourselves this liberty," says Tertullian, "to bring in anything of our will, nor choose anything that other men bring in of their will; we have the Apostles themselves for authors, which themselves brought nothing of their own will, but the discipline which they received of Christ they delivered faithfully to the people."—(*De Praescript*, c. 6.) "The christian religion shall find," says Cyprian, "that out of this Scripture rules of all doctrine have sprung, and that from hence doth spring, and hither doth return whatsoever the ecclesiastical discipline contained."—(*Quoted in Hooker's works vol. 1. p. 202.*) "Whether it be a question of Christ," says Augustine, "or whether it be a question of his church, or of what thing soever the question be; I say not, if we, but if an angel from heaven shall tell us anything beside that you have received in Scripture under the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed."—(*Cont. Liter. Petil. lib. 3, c. 6.*) "We use the Holy Scripture as our rule for every doctrine and our law," says Gregory of Nyssa; "and being under the necessity of referring to this, we receive that only which may be agreeable to the scope of what is there written."—(*Ep. ad Canonicas. 52, 1, 3.*) "We maintain," says Dr. Goode, of the church of England, "that those rites and ordinances only are essentially binding upon all churches and individuals that are required by Scripture authority."—(*Divine Rule, vol. 2. p. 20.*) "As every doctrine is false," says Dr. Hill, "which derogates from any of the offices that belong to Jesus as the Savior of the world, and which pretends to substitute anything else in the place of his interposition, so all authority in the church that is not derived from him must be an usurpation. Neither is it enough that those who exercise the authority, use his name in the acknowledgment of the origin of their power; for the sovereign authority of the Lord Jesus requires, that what they profess to derive from him, they uniformly exercise according to his directions."—(*Lec. on Divinity, 746.*) But a higher authority hath said, "TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY: IF THEY SPEAK NOT ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM."

And that the Scriptures really contain all necessary directions for the right administration of church affairs, and for the decision of all questions relating to what is essential in church polity, is not to be disputed. Some indeed teach us differently; but such teachers hardly know what they say. And if

these statements were even true, so far from proving that it is for men to devise a government for the church, they would rather prove that no such government is necessary. To reason otherwise, would argue the incompetency of the Divine Legislator, or that a confidence has been reposed in the perfection of human wisdom, which has uniformly been disappointed. The reign of human contrivances in the church, has been the reign of ignorance, corruption and contention. But their statements are not true. The church is a *society*—a body politic; and as such, its essential constitution and organic laws are coexistent with itself, and inseparable from its being. “A church without a government,” says Sawyer, “is a contradiction in terms. It takes organization to make a church, and organization is a provision for associated action.”—(*Organic Christianity*, p. 23.) Therefore, as the Scriptures give us the history of its organization, they must needs also contain whatever essentially appertains to its government; or else Christ gave us but an imperfect church, and it remains for man to put the finishing touches upon the workmanship of God! And surely, “it is no small injury done to the word of God to pin it in so narrow room, as that it should be able to direct us but in the principal points of our religion; or as though the substance of religion, or some rude and unfashioned matter of building of the church were uttered in them, and those things were left out that should pertain to the form and fashion of it; or as if there were in the Scriptures only to cover the church’s nakedness, and not also chains and bracelets and rings and other jewels to adorn her and set her out.” (See a passage quoted in Hooker’s Works, vol. 1. p. 226.) With Vincent, the presbyter of Lirius, we hold, that “the canon of Scripture is *perfect, and most abundantly, of itself, sufficient for all things*” that concern the faith and administrations of God’s church. As observed by one of the old Puritan champions, “our Savior is said, with charge and commandment that they should be observed, to have delivered to his disciples such things, as for the space of forty days he delivered unto them concerning his kingdom; a part whereof must needs be understood to have been of the government of his church.” “This we do affirm,” says Dr. Goode, “that having four different accounts of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the last written for the very purpose of making the account complete, and above twenty epistles written by the Apostles to explain it still further, to say that *anything at all important is omitted, is a foul libel upon that Holy Spirit by which the Apostles were guided.*”—(Divine Rule, vol. 1. p. 410.)

Jesus himself promised his Apostles the Spirit which should "guide them into *all truth*." Paul declares that, "the Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation," and that they contain what is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: *that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished* unto all good works." And the canon of Scripture closes with words which assign to it an awful majesty, and which stamp the name of vanity and lies upon all traditions and authorities which men presume to set up by its side: "If any man shall *add unto* these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall *take away from* the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

To examine, analyse, understand, and set forth the true polity of the church of Jesus Christ, as contained in the Scriptures, would then be one of the most important, noble, and useful efforts of the christian student. And yet, how few, in these days, ever think of making the attempt at a thorough and systematic inquiry upon this subject? What books have we that undertake to discuss it, except in the mere smattering way of sectarian recommendations of systems already in existence? In which of our Theological Seminaries is it taught as a vital part of the religion of Jesus Christ, or where the professors go beyond the mere preparation of the student to practice under the forms which his church lays down to him? How many who scarcely have any christianity except what is wrapt up in their church systems, yet think the department of church government an unimportant, if not an indifferent matter? Looking at the variety of opinions that have been broached, and in behalf of each of which so long a list of learned, venerable, and reverend names can so easily be furnished, how many are frightened from the subject as not within the mastery of the human understanding, and with wonderful wisdom conclude that "whatever is, is right?" But why do we falter and hesitate in this manner, and give ourselves up to a supineness which concedes the claim of Divinity to things the most contradictory and unauthorized? What doctrine of the Bible has not been involved in the same difficulty, and enveloped in the same clouds? All that belongs to the attributes of Godhead, the characteristics of his moral government, the powers and spiritual condition of man, and the final issue when Jesus Christ shall surrender up the kingdom to the Father, all have been handled with equal irreverence, and presented in

sectarian forms equally misshapen. And if we are to despair of learning the Divine will upon themes of such vital interest because they have upon them the smell of polemic chivalry, we might as well conclude at once to cease to be christians altogether; for such pusillanimity would soon degrade our christian graces into mere fragments of human policy, our assurances of heaven into petty intellectual conceits, and our dearest hopes into shreds of contradictory speculations.

To enter into a general investigation of the organic laws and constitutional powers and prerogatives with which Jehovah has endowed his church, is not now our purpose. We are looking only to a brief examination of a specific question, and only those Divine arrangements which concern it. The remarks which we have thus far made, may serve to show how all questions of ecclesiastical jurisprudence are to be approached, and by what authority they are to be settled, as well as to justify the freest examination into the righteousness of any and every act of ecclesiastical judicature.

A portion of the Lutheran church has been recently agitated with what has been given out under the name of "The Maryland Synod's question." Twice has that subject been before the Synod. It has been debated at some length in our church periodicals. And in various circles has it been talked of, flippantly by some, but seriously by the most. The most elaborate production that has appeared upon it, is contained in the Review for April 1855. The pretensions of that article, its one-sided and specious presentation of the point in dispute, its assignment of motives of mere ambition and lawlessness to those who differ with its writer, together with its urgent advocacy and defence of the exercise of very questionable synodical power, render it important that the other way of stating and arguing the case should also, in the same connection, be laid before the church. "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him."

THE QUESTION.

Whatever range or diversity there has been in the questions debated by different disputants in this discussion, the simple point before the Synod is, the propriety of giving testimonials of good standing, or a certificate of honorable dismission, to a true and worthy member of the Synod, if, peradventure, that member should feel himself conscientiously impelled for the time to withdraw from synodical membership. The question involved, is the question of synodical power over the ministerial commission.

The constitution of the Synod of Maryland has a provision that "no minister or licentiate shall be absent from the meeting of the Synod without the most urgent necessity. In case of non-attendance, he shall send to the Synod a written apology, stating the cause of his absence. A mere declaration that it was out of his power, or impossible to attend, shall not be regarded as satisfactory, neither shall official duties nor pastoral engagements constitute a sufficient excuse. None but high and imperious considerations shall be deemed adequate. Any minister or licentiate violating this provision, shall be called to account by the President at the next Synod, and a vote that the absentee is not excused, shall be understood to convey a tacit censure. If any minister or licentiate be absent from two successive Synods, and neglect to send a written excuse, or if the excuse sent be not sustained by a majority of the Synod, the delinquent shall be subject to the discipline of the Synod."—(I, Sec. 8.) What this "discipline of the Synod" is, may be learned from certain proceedings recorded in the Minutes of 1848, p. 21. We there read, "9, No communication having been received from Rev. ———, a licentiate of this Synod, your committee recommend *that his license be not renewed*. Adopted. 10. Rev. ———, having been absent again and again without excuse, having been admonished by the action of Synod, and informed that unless he appear, or send by letter an adequate excuse for absence, his name shall be stricken from our list, and having disregarded all, your committee recommend *that his name be stricken from our roll, and this fact published in the Observer*. Adopted." How far this sort of proceeding was intended to affect the ministerial standing and authority of a member, is not officially stated. But the withdrawal of licensure in the one case, and the publication of the name of the party in the other, shows, that it was designed to inflict a deep, if not deadly wound. The evident object in the mind of the Synod was, to break down the excised member's ministerial character and influence, to banish him from the pulpits of the churches, and, at least in effect, to depose him. At any rate, the advocates and exponents of the measure which we are resisting, seem so to understand it, and to think it ought to be. The writer in the Review claims, that the Synod is the church, and holds with Punchard, that there are but two ways—one by commendatory dismissal to a sister church, and the other by excommunication—of becoming disconnected from a church. And as the erasure of a member's name separates him from the Synod, and is not a commendatory dismissal, it must needs, in the

view of that writer, sunder him from the church, and be an effectual excision. "D.," of the Lutheran Observer, maintains, that "synodical connection is *essential* to ministerial standing," and that those ministers who do not remain in the synodical organization are to be "cut off and declared no longer a part of the church." With him, therefore, for a minister to lose his membership in Synod, is to lose his ministerial standing, to be excluded from the clerical band, and to all intents divested of his office. Common consistency compels these men to this position; for, if a man remains a true minister, and his acts are still to be regarded as valid Lutheran ministrations, after his synodical membership has thus been ruptured by "the discipline of the Synod," there can be no just ground for not giving an honorable dismissal to a member who has always been in good standing, although he may not intend to connect elsewhere. They have accordingly conducted their entire argument upon this one fundamental assumption, that separation from the Synod, without joining some other such association, is separation from the church, apostacy from Christ, and a return to the ungodly world. The disciplinary excision of a man from the Synod, must therefore be regarded as only another form of deposition. So these men present it, and so we must meet it. The constitution expressly provides, that non-attendance for two successive meetings, unless for "high and imperious considerations," involving "*the most urgent necessity*," of which the Synod is judge, subjects a member to this disciplinary degradation. A member then, who is impelled, by reasons amply satisfactory and urgent to his own mind, but which the majority might not regard as coming within "*the most urgent necessity*," to absent himself from synodical meetings, must either secure an honorable dismissal exempting him from this stringent and arbitrary regulation, or be ministerially ruined, and disgracefully deposed. And for the Synod to deny such a dismissal to a worthy brother when it is asked, is to make connection with, and punctilious attendance upon the Synod essential to ministerial character and authority. Is this a law of Jesus Christ? Do the Scriptures allow to Synods such authority? Has the Lord made it necessary, or given the right to earthly confederations to require, that a man must thus submit to those onerous exactions, in order to be a true minister of Christ? This is the drift of the question we moot.

To avoid this obvious and striking feature of this unpleasant subject, the effort has been made, by inuendo and insinu-

ation, to throw around the course of the applicant for dismissal, whose case generated all this debate, an odor of misanthropy, impiety, and ecclesiastical expatriation, by which to make it seem sinful to have given him testimonials of good standing, and thus to gain a sort of extraneous foundation for the proceeding against which we protest. It has even been said, that it was his purpose not to take charge of congregations, not to unite with any other ecclesiastical body, and not to associate in church fellowship with any body of christians under the sun. But all these are surreptitious things, unfounded in fact, and which no man would dare to say if that deceased brother were here to vindicate himself. They do gross injustice to the dead, and wrong his surviving friends, to whom nothing of him but his reputation now remains. At the time the President granted his dismissal *ad interim*, he had a call to certain congregations in another State, which, as he then said, he was strongly inclined to accept. He continued to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments to the poor and neglected, even to the time of his death. He never withdrew, and never thought of withdrawing from the communion of God's people, or from any of the appropriate duties of religion. When he applied for an honorable dismissal, he had already passed far beyond the meridian of life. He wished to be released from those rigid requirements to attend the synodical meetings. His age, and his more than thirty years of laborious and faithful service of his Synod and church, entitled him to much consideration and indulgence. He wished a certificate of honorable dismissal, so that if at any time he should desire to resume his membership, (which upon certain contingencies he promised to do) or, in case of removal, to connect with some other Synod, he might be able to do it without embarrassment or difficulty. Such were his views and feelings as he himself described them to the President at the time. The Synod, by a vote of twelve to eleven, denied his request. By so doing, it placed his ministerial commission in jeopardy, by reducing him to the alternative of servile submission to arbitrary synodical laws, or inglorious degradation from the sacred office. The whole taken together, was a stout and high-handed proclamation, that no man can be a minister without attendance upon the Synod. Was this authorized by the law of God? Had the Synod a right to deny the request of dismissal to a good and holy man, only to depose him from his ministry for a conscientious absention of himself from its meetings? It is astonishing that any one, with the Bible in his hand, should hesitate to give a decided negative to such a

question. Yet, there are those who affirm, and pertinaciously insist, that the Synod was right, and acted scripturally, and call it foul "radicalism" and "licentiousness" for any man to bring it in question. These affirmations we do most solemnly and unqualifiedly deny.

Fraternal voluntary associations of ministers and churches of the same faith and feeling, and living contiguous to each other, are doubtless desirable, and fall in with the whole spirit of the Gospel. Our forefathers, in 1760, in "the city of brotherly love," agreed in convention, that "it is highly expedient and useful, that laborers of one master, and in one vineyard, should be intimately acquainted with each other, that the bond of christian love may be cemented, that ministers may *consult* together on the extension of the kingdom of God, and each one, according to the measure of grace received, may labor for the common good, that they may encourage, exhort and comfort each other, decide questions of conscience in love, *with mildness*, simplicity and christian humility: that they may discover and amend mutual failings: settle differences and causes of suspicion, inasmuch as a family or kingdom at variance with itself cannot stand; and as a *spiritual union and harmony* among ministers is calculated to make a deep impression on the minds of friends and foes, a synodical meeting is calculated to keep out of the church disorderly men, pretending to claim the ministerial office, and by its means our young ministers may also enjoy opportunities to learn from the experience of the elder."—(*Hist. of Am. Luth. Church, by Dr. Hazelius, p. 82-84.*) It is accordingly stated in our "Formula of Government and Discipline," that "it was found necessary and profitable, in the primitive church, to have an *occasional meeting* of different individual churches, for the purpose of *consultation and mutual encouragement* in preserving purity and promoting their welfare. This custom is retained in the Lutheran church under the name of Conference, Synod, &c."—(*Chap. 8, Sec. 1.*) To all this we most heartily subscribe. We have no wish to see Synods abolished. But we feel it a solemn duty we owe to God, and to the church of God, both present and to come, to do what in us lies to prevent them from assuming to themselves the exercise of powers for which they were never intended. The building up of an unwarranted lordship over the free consciences of the sons of God—the process of making essential to the church, or to ministerial authority, what its Lord has not made essential to it—the attempt to enforce mere human enactments by Divine sanctions that have never been given—the subordination, of

gifts chartered from heaven, to the arbitrary disposal of earth's judgment of expediency—all of which we consider implied in the proceeding whose propriety we question, certainly call for serious and earnest resistance. Some may think that we are exalting a mole-hill into a mountain, and ridicule us as straining at a gnat. But straws, as well as icebergs, may show the direction of the current. And usurpation had better be strangled in its infancy, than left to grow until brave hearts shall cower before its giant strength. The prophecies and warnings of Scripture respecting "the commandments of men," and the workings of the Mystery of iniquity, and the sad history of christendom for many a gloomy century, are enough to make all faithful men jealous with exceeding jealousy of all this church legislation under the plea of expediency and necessity. It was this plea which, in six centuries, transformed the democratic and independent christian societies which constituted the church of Christ in the first ages, into a great consolidated despotism, which darkened the world with its Upas shades. Apart from all this, right and wrong are not to be measured by the scale on which they are enacted. There is as much theft in the unlawful taking of a dime, as in the unlawful taking of millions. And for the humblest Synod unlawfully to jeopard or revoke the ministerial authority of its humblest member, is an usurpation as real as the pope's interdict of a nation. We now ask the readers attention to the following

STATEMENTS OF OUR ARGUMENT.

I. By refusing the certificate of honorable dismissal to the worthy brother, who had deliberately and solemnly made up his mind that he could not attend the synodical meetings, the Synod of Maryland necessitated itself, under its existing constitution, to discipline, disgrace, and, at least in effect, to depose him, for non-attendance. Such a negation of the Divine commission of a minister of Jesus Christ, for such a cause, is unwarranted in Scripture. The act, therefore, which reduced the Synod to such a necessity, was equally unwarranted.

That the blessed Savior has appointed a ministry for his church, is a point which need not here be argued. The constitution of the Maryland Synod places "the Divine institution of the ministry" among "the fundamental doctrines of the word of God." To those who attach so much sacredness to synodical proceedings, this alone will be sufficient. Neither will it be necessary to inquire, in this connection, into the methods which the Scriptures present for the legitimization of

the ministry. It is enough to know that there is some authorized plan by which men on earth become invested with a commission from heaven to act as ambassadors for God in the work of the Gospel ministry. And as an expressed Divine warrant is essential to constitute a Divine ministry, nothing short of a similar warrant will authorize the taking of that ministry from a man who has once received it. What mere human power can undo the work of Deity without an explicit grant from him? It has been questioned by many learned Divines, though without satisfactory reason, whether God has given authority to dispossess a man of the ministry for any cause whatever. We believe there is such authority in the church, derived, not from human reasoning concerning expediency—human expediency never can set aside a Divine appointment—but from the Scriptures of truth. Revelation requires of christians to avoid them that serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, and cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine the apostles taught; to withdraw from him who teaches contrary to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ (*ἡρεποδοῦσαν μὲν*), and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; to reject him that is a heretic; to hold those as anathema who preach another gospel; and not to receive or bid God speed to any who bring not with them the doctrine of Christ. (Rom. 16: 17, 18; 1 Tim. 6: 3, 5; Tit. 3: 10; Gal. 1: 8, 9; 2 John 10.) "Judas by transgression fell;" and prophecy said, "*his bishopric let another take.*" By arrangement of God, then, ministerial authority, as well as private membership, is vitiated by apostacy from Christ. Our constitution, therefore, proceeds upon a true foundation, in providing that a minister guilty of "drunkenness, lewdness, circulating fundamental errors in doctrine, or a higher crime," has forfeited his office, and is to be accounted as an heathen man and a publican "until after some time of penitent, humble and edifying conduct." God has authorized all christian people to disown the ministry of such a man, and to refuse communion with him. But where there is no flagrant wickedness, or fundamental heresy, amounting to apostacy from Christ, he has given no power to disown or degrade any of his ministers. Non-attendance upon synodical meetings is no immorality. It violates no law of nature, and no precept of revelation. It is not heresy. It repudiates none of the essential doctrines of christianity. It involves no apostacy from Christ. To depose an ambassador of Jehovah, then, for this cause alone, is a thing of dreadful daring—an attempt to appropriate to humanly prerogatives that have not been given it—an effort to bind

God's institutes with earth-made fetters—a piece of antichristian presumption which no man can successfully defend. And yet, in refusing a dismission to the brother who asked for it, the Synod obliged itself to do this very thing, and hence did a misdeed which should be undone as speedily as possible.

II. The Synod, in refusing to exempt one of its worthy members from the rigid requirement to attend its sessions, and yet adhering to constitutional provisions to degrade him if he should not attend, was an attempt to enforce obedience to its enactments by Divine sanctions—by the penalty of rupturing his official relations to Christ and the church of Christ. But, for mere human voluntary compacts, without Divine constitution, or legislative authority from heaven, simply for want of servile submission to its arbitrary laws, thus to attempt to annul the commission and prerogatives which Christ himself, by his own arrangements, has given to a man, is an unwarranted assumption, and a reprehensible interference with the Savior's lordship over the church. Synods are nothing more than such human compacts, and hence the proceedings of the Synod of Maryland, in the case before us, were wholly unauthorized and blameworthy.

The free, congregational, independent and democratic character of the church of Christ for the first century of its existence, is now settled beyond the power of confutation. "The apostolic churches," says Coleman, "were entirely independent of each other. Each individual church assumed the form of a little distinct republic or commonwealth."—(*Ancient Christ. Exemplified*, p. 475.) Speaking of "the primitive and apostolic model of church government," Gibbon says, "The societies which were instituted in the cities of the Roman Empire, were united only by the ties of faith and charity. Independence and equality formed the basis of their internal constitution."—(*Dec. and Fall*, Chap. 15.) "All congregations were independent of one another," says Gieseler, "though some had a peculiar reputation more than others, on account of many circumstances, such as their apostolic origin, the importance of the city to which they belonged, or because they were mother churches."—(*Ecc. Hist. vol. 1., p. 92, 160.*) "The churches in those early times," says Mosheim, "were entirely independent; none of them subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed by its own rulers, and its own laws." Even during a great part of the second century, he says, "the churches were independent on each other; nor were they joined together by association, confederation, or any other bonds but those of charity. Each christian assembly

was a little state, governed by its own laws."—(*Ecc. Hist. vol. 1, p. 145.*) "At first," says Ranke, "the church conducted itself in accordance with republican forms."—(*History of Popes, p. 19.*) It formed no extensive combinations," says Sawyer, "and claimed no extensive jurisdictions. It had no universal, national, or provincial establishments. It had only city and congregational societies. Each of these limited and local societies was independent of all the rest, and of all the world. Each of them was a church of God, a province in his Divine kingdom, subject only to him, and under him possessing all the rights of spiritual sovereignty; and it administered all its affairs without any dictation from abroad."—(*Organic Christianity, p. 85.*) "Originally," says Dr. Isaac Barrow, "the church hath no other general lawgiver, beside our one Lord. Anciently the church had no other laws beside the Divine laws." "Each church, therefore, separately did order its own affairs, without recourse to others, except for charitable advice or relief, in cases of extraordinary difficulty, or urgent need. Each church was endowed with a perfect liberty, and a full authority, without dependence or subordination to others. This appeareth by the apostolic writings of St. Paul and St. John to single churches."—(*Barrow's Works, New York, 1845, vol. 3, p. 228, 326.*) But quotations need not be multiplied. Neander, Plank, Knapp, D'Aubigne, Wilson, Miller, King, Waddington, and a host of great divines, say the same things. Synods, councils, and general ecclesiastical courts, did not exist in the first century. They did not arise until long after the apostles had entered into their rest. It was only when "the blood of Christ was no longer warm in the veins of the disciples," that men began to league together to legislate upon general ecclesiastical affairs, and to make laws to regulate the faith, polity, and manners of the churches which God had left free. "There does not appear, in the first century," says Mosheim, "even the smallest trace of that association of provincial churches, from which councils and metropolitans derive their origin. It was only in the second century that the custom of holding councils commenced."—(*Ecc. Hist. 1, p. 93.*) Even the Romanist, Du Pin, was constrained to say, that "in the first three ages of the church, these assemblies were rare. . . The first councils that are mentioned in antiquity, are those that were held under the pontificate of pope Victor, to adjust the celebrated controversy about keeping Easter. . . It must be acknowledged, that the apostles were content to preach the doctrine and morality of our blessed Savior, without giving themselves the trouble to regulate what related

to the ceremonies or discipline of the church.”—(*History of Ecc. Writers, Dublin, 1723, vol. 1, p. 581.*) “It was in the second century,” says Coleman, “that primitive liberty and independence began to be relinquished and merged in a confederation of the churches of a province or country. . . The conventions or assemblies held by delegates from the associated churches, were called by the Greeks, *Synods*, and the Latins, *Councils*.”—(*Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 475.*) “The first Synods,” says Gieseler, “were held in 160–170.”—(*Ecc. Hist. vol. 1. p. 160.*) Neander says, that “out of the representative assemblies of the city communities,—the Amphyctionic councils—sprung the representative assemblies of the church communities—the provincial *Synods*.”—(*Neander's Hist. of Church and Rel. vol. 1. p. 206.*) “These assemblies were at first regarded as *innovations*, and violent opposition to them existed for a long time. There were not, at first, regularly appointed seasons for the sessions of these bodies, but they were called together as circumstances required. In the middle of the third century, however, we find the existence of annual Synods in many of the provinces.”—(*Coffin's Christian Fathers, p. 329.*) All this is sustained by Tertullian, who, in the third century, incidentally mentions, that in Greece it is the custom of the churches to hold councils for *consultation* upon their common interests, and that the decisions of these councils are treated with great respect, although of merely human origin and authority.—(*De Jejuniis c. 13.*)

From these authorities, it is clearly established, *first*, that, for the first hundred years after Christ, there were no such things in the church as Synods, the earliest account of them dating no further back than the year 160; and *second*, that Synods are nothing but human compacts, appointed by human authority, regarded in their incipency as being instituted neither by Christ nor by his apostles, but as innovations upon the original apostolic system, and therefore also of no essential consequence to the church of Christ.

But here we shall be told that the fifteenth chapter of Acts tells of a Synod or council held in apostolic times. A little attention to the subject, however, will give to that transaction a very different face from that put upon it by those who quote it as scriptural authority for Synods. Mosheim says, “it is commonly considered as the first christian council. But this notion arises from the manifest abuse of the word *council*. That meeting was only of one church; and, if such a meeting be called a *council*, it will follow that there were innumer-

able councils in the primitive times. But every one knows, that a *council* is an assembly of deputies or commissioners, sent from several churches associated by certain bonds in a general body, and therefore the supposition above mentioned *falls to the ground*."—(*Ecc. Hist.* 1. 93—note.) "An ecclesiastical council," says Coleman, "may be defined to be a Synod, composed of a number of representatives from several independent christian communities, convened together to deliberate and decide upon matters relating to the welfare of the church."—(*An. Christ. Exemp.* 477.) Every one will see at once that the meeting of the "apostles and elders" of Jerusalem was no such a Synod.

From the earliest periods of christianity, it was the custom to refer questions of difficulty to some one of the mother churches for counsel and advice. Mosheim says, "the churches founded by the apostles had this particular deference shown them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases; yet they had no judicial authority, no sort of supremacy over the others, nor the least right to enact laws for them."—(*Ecc. Hist.* 1. 92.) Thus King tells us that "Cyprian wrote to the church of Rome for advice. For, saith he, 'dearly beloved brother, both common sense and love require, that none of these things that are transacted here, should be kept from your knowledge, but that we should have your counsel.'" Bearing this with us to the occurrences recorded in the fifteenth of Acts, we shall be able to estimate and interpret it aright. The church at Jerusalem was the original—the mother church. There resided several of the apostles. And there, if anywhere, they would be able to throw light upon any intricate problem touching the christian system. Paul, in the meantime, had planted a church in the Gentile city of Antioch, where he and Barnabas were laboring. Many Gentiles believed, and were received by Paul without being required to submit to the burdensome rites of the Jewish law. While Paul was thus going on with his apostolic work, certain members of this church at Jerusalem (v. 1 : 24) appeared in Antioch, and represented to Paul's converts that he had acted improperly in exempting them from the Jewish obedience. "They said, except ye be circumcised, after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Paul and Barnabas withstood them; but as they held membership in the mother church, and had just come down from Jerusalem, they had an advantage on their side which stirred up "no small dissension and disputation." What was to be done? Prudence would at once dictate that the

matter should be brought before the original church itself, to see whether its united opinion was as these Pharisees contended. So then it was agreed; and "Paul, and Barnabas, and certain other of them" went "up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." The authorities of the church at Jerusalem accordingly were convoked, "and the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." "Much disputing" ensued. Peter told what the Lord had done for the Gentiles in his case. Paul and Barnabas "declared what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." Everything finally came to a pause; and James, who had perhaps been presiding at the meeting, gave his "*sentence*"—*judgment—opinion*. (*εγω πρῶτος*—I select, choose, judge, opine, decide; Latin, *judico*—to judge, think, deem, suppose; Murdock's Syriac, "*I say to you*.") And his *saying* "pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church." And they embodied it in a letter, and sent it forth to the gentile churches as their "*decree*"—*δογμα—conclusion—determination*.¹ The letter denied that any such commandment had been given to those Pharisaic fault-finders as that the Gentiles must be circumcised. (v. 24.) Their power as troublers was therefore stricken from their hands. The mother church had now officially spoken its opinion on the subject. The other churches acquiesced in it as just and righteous. And Christendom had peace on that point. Such, then, was the character of that whole affair. In nothing but the "much disputing," does it bear the least resemblance to those subsequent and modern Synods which have sought to claim magisterial power under its protection. It was an assembly of the authorities of one particular congregation, with the few commissioners from the church of Antioch who brought up the question on which an expression of opinion was desired. It "was only attended, at most, by four apostles, Peter, James, John, and Paul."—(*Palmer on the Church*, vol. 2, p. 156.) The opinion which they expressed is never again referred to in the Scriptures, as having any binding force upon the church at large. Paul and Peter both afterwards acted in ways which showed very little regard for it, if not inconsistent.

¹ Bishop Pearce contends that *τα δογματα*, in Acts 16: 4, rendered "*the decrees*," is a gloss which was not in the text originally; and that the *τα κειρημενα*—*the judgments or determinations* of the apostles and elders, was all that was originally written here. The word *δογμα* is from *δοκεω*—*to teach—to think proper—to determine—to give an opinion—to agree upon—to resolve*.

ly with it.—(See 1 Cor. 4: 7-9; Acts 16: 3; Gal. 2: 11-14.) It was simply an official expression of opinion on the part of the mother church at Jerusalem, on a question respecting which it had been misrepresented, and concerning which its judgment was sought. No just criticism can make anything more out of it. As the distinguished Gottfried Arnold has said of it, "there was no imperious sentence, much less a judicial decree and imposition, but a fraternal and friendly announcement and declaration of the unanimously agreed conclusion. In a word; this *council*, if council it is to be called, is not one of those especially of the third and following centuries, from which it differs as widely as heaven from earth." (*Hist. of the Church and Heretics, Schaffhausen, 1740, vol. 1. p. 39.*)

Synods, therefore, are mere human compacts, introduced long after the Divine organization of the church was complete. They can have no existence except by articles of association which men, in their own unaided wisdom or folly have devised. The Scriptures give us no forms or precepts for synodical constitutions. Whatever powers of judicature Synods, as such, may wield, they have derived from man, and not from God. The sacred records provide for no such ecclesiastical courts. Obedience to them is nowhere enjoined as a part of christian or ministerial duty. "The truth is," says Barrow, "all ecclesiastical presidencies and subordinations or dependencies of some bishops on others in administration of spiritual affairs, were introduced merely by human ordinance, and established by law or custom upon prudential accounts." (*Works, vol. 3, p. 185.*) Synods, therefore, can have no right to condition or command the things of God, any further than God hath expressly spoken. What he has made free, they cannot bind. What he has ordained they cannot annul. What he has not made essential to discipleship or ministerial authority, cannot be made essential by them. As God made all the first churches independent, no human combinations can take that independence from them. When God has provided for the introduction of men into the sacred office, there is no power to make laws to put them out of it, except as God directs. If a minister of Christ can be held to remain in Syn-

¹ Es geschah kein herrschsüchtiger auspruch, viel weniger eine gewaltsame *decision* und *execution*, sondern eine brüderliche freundliche erinnerung und vortrag des einstimmigen schlusses. In summa; dieses *concilium*, wenn mans ja so nennen wolte, ist von denen andern, sonderlich im dritten und folgenden *seculis*, wie himmel und erde unterschieden.—Th. 1, B. 1. c. 3, § 14.

od, and compelled to attend its meetings on pain of losing his Divine commission, there must be an explicit Divine warrant to that effect. "For such a power," says Barrow, "it is needful that a commission from God, should be granted in downright and perspicuous terms, that no man concerned might have any doubt of it, or excuse for boggling at it."—(*Vol. 3, p. 80.*) "Those things can have no foundation or firmness," says Lactantius, "which are not sustained by any oracle of God's word."—(*Lact. 7, 2.*) But Synods have no such commission from God; and for them to undertake to enforce obedience to their peculiar and man-made regulations by the high penalty of the revocation of a Divine grant, and the abrogation of an expressed Divine appointment, is popish arrogance, and antichristian presumption. Alas, that such a proceeding should find advocates in this free land, and in our free church!

III. The Synod's refusal of an honorable dismissal to a worthy brother, and its consequent enforcement of attendance upon its meetings by the pains of degradation from his office, was an assertion of arbitrary judicatorial power which Synods were never designed to exercise, either when first introduced, or when organized by the Lutheran fathers of this country. They originated as fraternal consociations of ministers and delegates from free and independent churches, for the promotion of brotherly love, and for friendly deliberation upon common interests. "At first," says Sawyer, "the provincial councils did not interfere with the private matters of single churches, but deliberated on matters of general interest, and the attending bishops were considered as representatives of their churches. *At first they had no jurisdiction*, but were a kind of general conference, to consider, and, as far as possible, agree on matters of general interest."—(*Org. Christ. p. 103.*) "The pious prelates," says Mosheim, "at their first appearance in these general councils, acknowledged that they were no more than the delegates of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name, and by the appointment of their people. But they soon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their authority, *turned their influence into dominion, and their councils into laws*; and openly asserted, at length, that Christ had empowered them *to prescribe to his people authoritative rules of faith and manners.*"—(*Ecc. Hist. vol. 1, p. 146.*) Dr. Wilson, in his "Primitive Government of Christian Churches," remarks that "when Synods were introduced, *they were neither at first of appellative jurisdiction, nor founded on scriptural authority.*" Barrow tells us that "churches still had particular rights of independency

upon all power without themselves. Such as the church of Cyprus in the Ephesine Synod did claim and obtain the confirmation of."—(Vol. 3, p. 231.) Even so late as the fourth century, Gregory Nazianzen, writing to Procopius, thus expresses his purpose to absent himself from synodical meetings: "To tell you plainly, I am determined to fly all conventions of bishops; for I never yet saw a council that ended happily. Instead of lessening, they invariably augment the mischief. The passion for victory, and the lust of power, are not to be described in words. One present as a judge, will much more readily catch the infection from others, than be able to restrain it in them. For this reason I must conclude, that the only security for one's peace and virtue is in retirement."—(Quoted in *Duncan on Creeds*, p. 176.) What a contumacious reprobate! exclaim our modern advocates of synodical jurisdiction. How disrespectfully he speaks of the Synod! Shall he be allowed to go on in this way? Is not our Synod the church? Does not the nature of things require that he should be compelled to attend or lose his ministry? And yet Gregory Nazianzen was left to pursue his course undisturbed. If he would not attend, the council claimed no judicial power to compel him to attend.¹

And as the early Synods were designed as free paternal associations, without jurisdiction, such were designed to be the first Lutheran Synods of this country. "When our fathers reached this land of liberty," says Dr. Schmucker, "they at once adopted the form which Luther and Lutheran divines generally, have always regarded as the primitive one, namely, parity of ministers, the coöperation of the laity in church government, and the free VOLUNTARY convention of Synods." "They called no man master: they acknowledged no head but Christ, no absolute authority but the Bible."—(*Luth. Ch. in Amer.*, p. 118.) We have already quoted the reasons for which the Philadelphia convention of 1760 determined it desirable to "continue the yearly meetings of pastors and lay delegates." To make the ministers intimately acquainted

¹ We also give Cyprian's opinion of the binding authority of the doings of councils, as pronounced by him at the opening of the Synod of Carthage, in A. D. 256. "It remains that we severally declare our opinion on this same subject, (the rebaptizing of heretics) judging no one, nor depriving any one of the right of communion, if he differ from us. For no one of us setteth himself up as a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror forceth his colleagues to a necessity of obeying; inasmuch as EVERY BISHOP, in the free use of his liberty and power, has the RIGHT OF FORMING HIS OWN JUDGMENT."—Cyprian's Epistles, Oxford, p. 286. In Cyprian's view, then, Synods are purely deliberative, without binding authority, or compulsory jurisdiction.

with each other, to cement the bond of christian love, to *consult* on the extension of the kingdom of God, to encourage, exhort and comfort one another, to decide questions of conscience in love, mildness and humility, to settle differences, and remove causes of suspicion, to promote *spiritual* union and harmony among ministers, and by these means to furnish the young ministers greater facilities for improvement, and to keep out hypocritical men who say they are ministers, and are not; these were the objects they aimed at in organizing a Synod. To build up a compulsory power in the church, obedience to which should be demanded as a condition of ministerial character and authority, never entered into their thoughts. When the General Synod was formed, the same considerations governed. See Hazelius' "Lutheran Church in America," page 155. A judicatorial power, or legislative assembly, whose enactments were to be in any way essential, was never contemplated. "The Lutheran church," says Dr. Kurtz, "acknowledges special conferences, Synods, and a General Synod; but *all these are regarded rather as advisory bodies, than as judicatories.*"—(*Why a Luth.*, p. 24.) "In our American Lutheran system of government," says Dr. Schmucker, "Synods act chiefly as *advisory bodies—unions for advisory counsel and coöperation.*"—(*Am. Luth. Ch.* p. 191.) Accordingly, as late as 1843, it was given as one of the distinctive traits of the government of the Lutheran church, that if "pastor and members decline acceding to rules and regulations proposed and recommended by Synods, *they are not therefore unchurched and proscribed*, but still left to pursue the even tenor of their way unmolested."—(*Why a Luth.* p. 115.) And never, until 1853, in the city of Baltimore, in the Synod of Maryland, was it maintained that synodical membership, and punctual attendance upon synodical meetings, are indispensable to ministerial standing and authority in the Lutheran church. Doctors Bachman and Hazelius, in the Discipline of the South Carolina Synod, say expressly, "*our Synods are no JUDICATORIES, but merely ADVISORY BODIES.*"—(p. 106.) But, to refuse honorable dismission to a worthy man, and yet to hold him liable to degradation for non-attendance, was surely no mere *advisory* proceeding.

IV. The greatest mischiefs that have ever despoiled the church of Christ, have been mainly introduced through the medium of Synods, and the assignment to these human organizations of a judicatorial power, rendering their decisions and enactments binding upon the consciences of God's ministers and people.

Neander tells us, that when Synods were first instituted, they were objected to as an innovation; that they soon took a false and mischievous direction, ceased to be accompanied by a spirit of humility and self-renunciation, and sought to bind mutable things to immutable laws; that at length the bishops came to constitute the sole power in them, and by the union which these Synods enabled them to enter into with each other, made themselves more powerful every day.—(*History of Rel. and Ch. vol. 1. p. 206, 207.*) “These councils,” says Mosheim, “of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of the second century, changed the whole face of the church, and gave it a new form; for by them the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished, and the power and authority of the bishops greatly augmented. The humility, indeed, and prudence of these pious prelates prevented their assuming all at once the power with which they were afterwards invested. . . But they soon changed their humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their authority, turned [their influence into] DOMINION, and their *councils* into LAWS; and openly asserted at length, that Christ had empowered them to *prescribe* to his people *authoritative rules* of faith and manners. Another effect of these councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality, which reigned among all bishops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of these assemblies required, that some one of the provincial bishops met in council, should be invested with a superior degree of power and authority; and hence the rights of Metropolitans derived their origin. In the meantime, the bounds of the church were enlarged; the custom of holding councils was followed wherever the sound of the gospel had reached; and the universal church had now the appearance of one vast republic, formed by a combination of a great number of little states. This occasioned the creation of a new order of ecclesiastics, who were appointed, in different parts of the world, as heads of the church, and whose office it was to preserve the consistence and union of that immense body, whose members were so widely dispersed throughout the nations. Such was the nature and office of the Patriarchs, among whom, at length, ambition being arrived at its most insolent period, formed a new dignity, *investing the bishop of Rome, and his successors, with the title and authority of prince of the Patriarchs.*” In the third century, “the ancient method of ecclesiastical government, seemed in general, still to subsist; while, at the same time, by imperceptible steps, it varied from the primitive rule, and degenerated towards the

form of religious *monarchy*. The bishops aspired to higher degrees of power and authority than they formerly possessed ; and not only *violated the rights of the people*, but also made gradual *encroachments upon the privileges of the presbyters*. *And that they might cover these usurpations with an air of justice, and an appearance of reason, they PUBLISHED NEW DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH.* . They appropriated to their evangelical functions the splendid ensigns of temporal majesty ; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order.”— (*Ecc. Hist.* vol. 1., p. 146, 209.)

Thus arose the magisterial elements of ecclesiastical power, whose claims were constructed upon the despoiled privileges of individual conscience and the rights of man. Thus did spiritual things retrograde, as the usurpations of bishops and Synods gradually crept in between Christ and his Bride, and in place of her dignified simplicity of being under law to him, substituted the meretricious attire of human institutions, and subjected her to the forbidding laws of human compacts. And thus did the unity of the church come to be expounded as a *political principle*, with popery and all its harlotry, tyranny and blood following in its train, instead of that holy evangelic unity of spirit, of faith, of charity, of relation to one Lord who was crucified for all, and of the common observance of what that Lord has ordained. And surely men cannot be aware of these things, or they would not look so complacently on man-made church judicatories, or upon the process of making subjection to synodical regulations a pre-requisite to ministerial rights and church communion.

V. A disciple of Jesus Christ is bound by no obligation, either to God or man, to submit to synodical jurisdiction in order to become a legitimate minister ; and hence, to refuse to acknowledge him as a minister, for no other reason than his withdrawal from synodical jurisdiction, is presumptuous and tyrannical.

Certainly nothing can be essential to the church, or to its ministry now, which was not made essential when the Divine constitution of our dispensation was finished. If any one can dispute this doctrine, he can make room for anything. But we have proven, that, for more than a century after the inspired founders of the church were in their graves, there was no such thing as synodical jurisdiction in christendom. One of two things must then be true ; either submission to synodical jurisdiction is not necessary to valid ministerial endowments, or, for more than a hundred years after the apostles, there was

no valid ministry. To maintain the latter would be ridiculous and impious; and hence, to maintain the opposite of the former is to maintain a lie. *Any individual minister of Jesus Christ, possesses in himself all the official powers requisite to the production, equipment, and perpetuation of a true church of Jesus Christ.* Titus in Crete, in the capacity of an ordinary minister of Christ, had apostolic authority "to ordain elders in every city."—(Tit. 1: 5.) Timothy was but an ordinary minister of Christ; and yet, the apostle Paul, by inspiration of God, recognizes in him the power and right to admit men into the sacred office.—(1 Tim. 5: 22.) Accordingly, Luther, Melancthon, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen, Cruciger, Spalatin, Agricola, Osiander, John Brentius, and a host of great theologians of the olden time, have told us, that "*There is no doubt, if a pastor ordain some qualified persons in his congregation to church offices, SUCH ORDINATION IS VALID AND RIGHT, ACCORDING TO DIVINE AUTHORITY.*"—(*Smalcald Articles, App.*) We need scarcely say that Dr. Schmucker has expressed the view of the Lutheran church of this country to be, "As the apostle Paul directed Timothy and Titus to admit men to this office, we regard the ordination of *one minister as valid*, whether he be called bishop, or minister, or elder."—(*Luth. Ch. in Am. p. 73.*) And the writer in the April number of the Review, even goes so far as to say, that "the original power to elect and ordain to this work, is put, by the great head of the church, into the hands of the individual congregations."—(p. 536.) In that case, the great head of the church has positively excluded synodical interference in the election and ordination of the ministry! We insist, therefore, that as submission to synodical jurisdiction is not at all necessary to *become* a minister of Christ, so continuance under such jurisdiction cannot be necessary in order to *remain* a minister of Christ.

VI. A Synod, as the writer in the April Review concedes, is a free, voluntary association; as much so as a Temperance convention, Bible society, or Sunday School. "Every ministerial member," says he, "enters it voluntarily."—(p. 539.) There are no laws of God, natural or revealed, requiring of any man or church to enter it. Of this we have now had sufficient proof. It may be desirable to have a Bible Society. This union of effort for the spread of the inspired word, has been greatly blessed of God. So it may be prudent to have a Synod, and a good thing for ministers and christians thus to associate in mutual counsel upon their common work and aim.

But there is no binding law in the case. Expediency is the only plea that can be urged in favor of any such establishments. And that expediency, to be of any force, must make itself apparent to the judgment of him, whom it is to move. And as ministers and churches are thus without obligation to enter into Synods, and enter voluntarily, if they conduct themselves as christians whilst there, common sense and reason declare that they have a just right to leave them without disgrace. If nothing but a sense of propriety can be appealed to, to take them in, that selfsame sense of propriety is authority enough to bring them out, without a stigma upon their reputation.

VII. If the Synod has power to make arbitrary enactments respecting ministerial authority, and to make laws additional to the Bible respecting ministerial standing, and to enforce those laws by the penalty of degradation from the ministerial function; there is no reason, why it may not exercise equal power to legislate in matters of doctrine, and by the same penalties to enforce belief in transubstantiation, the immaculate conception of Mary, or anything else that the majority might think fit to make a matter of christian faith. God has given no more right to add to the Scriptures in the one than in the other. If the clerical *commission* can be conditioned by mere human laws, clerical *belief* may be similarly conditioned. The power claimed in the one case, is not less than would be required in the other case. The truth is, that there is no such power in either case. And no proceedings of ecclesiastical judicature, outside of the clear teachings of inspiration, can be of any force apart from the mere moral weight that may arise from the character, enlightenment, and upright intentions of the men concerned in them. Even the Westminster Confession of Faith says, "That all church power, whether exercised by the body in general, or in the way of representation by delegated authority, IS ONLY MINISTERIAL AND DECLARATIVE; that is to say, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners; that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws to bind the conscience, in virtue of their own authority."—(Chap. I. Sec. 7. See also Schmid's *Dogmatik der Luth. Kirche*, p. 489.)

VIII. The whole nature and spirit of evangelical christianity are opposed to arbitrary lordships and jurisdictions over God's people and ministers, and hence to this proceeding in the Synod of Maryland. The Gospel system, is a system of liberty. It was so predicted: (Is. 42: 7; 61: 1.) It was so proclaimed by its first preachers: (Rom. 7: 6; 8: 2; Gal. 5: 1.) Liberation from oppressive exactions is one of its charac-

teristics. (Gal. 4 : 3-7.) Paul says, "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?" (1 Cor. 10 : 29.) "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." (Gal. 5 : 1.) We are not, indeed, to abuse our liberty, or to use it as a cloak for maliciousness: (1 Pet. 2 : 16;) but the only thing that can bind us to subjection in any matter, is the expressed will of God. The Savior's kingdom is not of this world. Paul tells us that it consists in spiritual influences on the mind and heart, producing virtue, joy, and peace. (Rom. 14 : 17.) It requires not to be managed by political artifices, or fleshly wisdom. (1 Pet. 2 : 1.) It needs not to be supported by compulsive force and violence. (1 Cor. 1 : 27, 28; Jas. 2 : 5.) It discountenances the imposition of any laws or precepts not given by the Lord, or which may detract from christian liberty and Gospel simplicity. (Matt. 15 : 9; Col. 2 : 8, 20, 21; Gal. 4 : 10.) The government of the christian state is represented as purely spiritual, administered by meekness and persuasion, and not by imperious awe. (2 Cor. 1 : 24; 4 : 5; Gal. 6 : 1.) It is expressly forbidden to ministers to domineer over God's heritage. (1 Pet. 5 : 3; Matt. 20 : 25, 26.) John once came to the Savior, and said, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and *we forbade him, because he followed not with us.*" It would seem that then, as now, some people would rather see devils in men, than behold them cast out by such as do not submit to their dictation! But, *the Savior said, "Forbid him not."* (Luke 9 : 49, 50.) Utterly foreign, therefore, to the whole nature and spirit of the Gospel, are all attempts to establish ecclesiastical legislatures, to which to demand submission as a condition of discipleship and ministerial standing.

Here, then, is our foundation. And we humbly submit to the reader whether it is not firm and immovable. We proceed now to answer the

ARGUMENTS OF THOSE WHOM WE RESIST.

I. It is argued, that to ask a dismission from the Synod, without designing to connect with some other Synod, Conference, Presbytery, or Consociation, is to ask a dismissal from the church of Christ, which is a request which no christians can grant. "It cannot be the will of God that any one remain without the pale of the church," we are told, "and much less, that any one belonging to it, whether minister or layman, should abandon it, or be dismissed from it. Whither will he

go? He can but return to the world, which is at enmity with God, and from which it is his duty to escape. The act of leaving the church, or desiring a dismission from the church, is not christian. It is contrary to the will of God, and therefore cannot be claimed as a right.”—(*Review*, vol. 6, p. 524.) This has been the *os magnum* in the whole of this debate on that side of the question—the monster that all our opponents have been presenting. Let us then take him directly by the horns.

This argument takes it for granted that the Synod is the church, and that there is no church outside of synodical associations. So confidently is this assumed, that the writer in the *Review* says, “if any one assert that a Synod is not the church, we desire to have no controversy with that man. With such an one we cannot reason.” But we are not to be frightened by disdainful looks and contemptuous gibes. Goliath scorned such an antagonist as David, and yet found his death in that stripling’s hand. If we were to admit this bold assumption, for which not a particle of reason is given, there might be some force in the argument. The church has rights and powers, and holds all men under obligations, by endowments from her God, which we have neither the wish nor the conscience to deny. But, as Calvin said of the Romanists, “If we should even concede to our adversaries all the claims which they set up on behalf of the church, yet this would effect but little towards the attainment of their object. For whatever is said of the church, *they immediately transfer to the councils.*”—(*Inst. lib. 4, c. 9, § 1.*) A council or Synod is one thing, but the church is another thing. Such was Calvin’s view of the matter at any rate, although he may be too insignificant a personage to engage the attention of our notable Reviewer! We assert and maintain, that Synods, as such, are not the church of Christ, as that church is spoken of and presented to our contemplation in the Holy Scriptures. In support of this, we allege the following considerations:

1st. The christian church was constituted by Christ and his inspired servants. They organized it, and furnished it with all that belongs to it, and so equipped it, that no human hands had power to constrain, alter or limit it, after the last of the apostles died. It is obviously preposterous to suppose, that anything essential to it was left wanting by those who were sent of God to give it existence, form, and organic being; or that that should now be the church, which was not the church, or any part of it, when its heaven-directed framers left it. They certainly knew what the church is, and what constitutes

and is to be called the church. And yet, what they planted and named the church of Christ was not a Synod, or anything in the shape of such an external, delegatorial, political confederation. There was no such thing as a Synod in what they founded as the church, for more than a hundred years after they were dead. Either then, the Synod, as such, is not what the Scriptures denominate the church, or there was no church for a century subsequent to the time when inspiration says it was founded. The writer in the Review agrees that the form of government in the early church was purely congregational, and that "this form of government continued until the close of the second century." Of course then, there was for that time no synodical confederation and jurisdiction. And yet he disdains to have anything to say to the man who asserts a distinction between the Synod and the church.

2nd. The same writer admits, that "Synods are voluntary associations," and that "every member enters voluntarily." There is no Divine law requiring of any one to unite with them. But of the church, he says, it is the will of God that all should belong to it, and that no one has a right to act in opposition to the will of God. It seems then, from his own showing, that God hath spoken, and made obligations with respect to the one, but not with respect to the other. How can they then be one and the same?

3d. Synods are human institutions, originating in the will of mere man, and with constitutions of earthly manufacture. "D.," of the Observer, says, "we do not contend for the Divine origin of Synods;" and his colleague, in the Review, traces them to "the law of man's social nature," and tells us that their powers are acquired by gift or consent of congregations. We have also shown that there were no synodical organizations until long after inspiration had ceased. They are then mere human organizations. But the church was originated in heaven, and constituted and established by Jehovah himself. It is in no sense a human fabrication, but an institute of God, with officers, terms of membership, ordinances, and laws of being appointed and ordained by him. It is "a supernatural society," which did not evolve itself from "the law of man's social nature," but which came direct from the hands of God. And are we to be told, that a Divine institute, and a mere human organization, are the same? What new Pantheism is this, that claims as much Divinity for what mere men have done, as for what has been done by the adorable son of God?

4th. The Synod is the creature of the church. The churches

made Synods, not God. And can the thing made be the same with its maker? Is there identity between the creature and the creator? How then can the Synod be the church?

5th. "The church," says our noble Confession, "is properly nothing else than the congregation of all believers and saints." But Synods are something more, and very different from the mere society of those who believe and confess Christ, neither do they include, in any way, all believers and saints. Synods are political confederations beyond, and (as some desire) above the simple brotherhood of those who receive the truth as it is in Jesus; and there were millions of believers translated to glory before there were Synods, and there are thousands of saints now living who have no synodical connections, and acknowledge no synodical jurisdiction. How then can the Synod be the church?

6th. The church which God instituted consists of independent individual congregations of christian confessors communing at one table, each of which, though confined to a single household, is as much God's church, and as really contains all the constituents of a church of God, as one drop of water contains all the elements of an ocean of waters. But a Synod is a mere confederation of delegates from some of these independent individual congregations, and that only by human arrangement and authority. It cannot, therefore, be the church.

7th. But, some will say, the Synod *represents* the church, and therefore is the church. Yet, even admitting that Synods do imperfectly represent a good portion of the church, is the representative the thing represented? Some say the bread and wine in the Eucharist *represent* the body and blood of Christ; do they mean that the bread and wine *are really* the body and blood of Christ? And if Synods do represent the church, it is a humanly constituted representation, and therefore without Divine and binding authority in that capacity.¹ Take away the human device called the representative, and the Divine original still remains. How can they then be the same?

8th. If Synods are the church, the substitution of the word *Synods* for the word *church*, will express the same sense, and speak the truth with equal accuracy. But how would it sound to read, Saul "made havoc of the *Synods* at Jerusalem!"—

¹ "Those who constitute an *ecclesiam representativam*," says Knapp, "possess this preëminence not *jure divino*, but *humano*. They ought not, therefore, to give out their decretals as *Divine*, and in the name of God. Their enactments are merely human, and ought to have no more than human authority."—*Theology*, vol. 2, p. 492.

"Feed the *Synods* of God"—"Salute Nymphas, and the *Synods* which are in his house!"—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my *Synods*!" Besides being ridiculous, such an exchange of these words would make Synods of Divine institution, and cause the Bible to say that there were Synods in apostolic times in every country and city, as well as in some private families! neither of which things are true.

There must, then, necessarily be a deep and wide distinction between the church and the Synod. The one existed more than a century before the other. The one is human, the other Divine. The one is free to be entered or not; the other obliges all men. The one is the mere creature of the other. The one has its constitution in the Bible, the other in articles of compact devised by men. The one embraces the entire congregation of all believers and saints; the other consists only of the few who see fit to join together in special voluntary combinations. The one may be utterly destroyed, and yet the other will remain. And these two things, with these radical differences between them, we are told, are one and the same! and that the man who will deny it is not fit to be reasoned with! Can it be possible, that the church of Luther, in this home of freedom, will permit herself to be thus hectoring into servile subjection to arbitrary synodical jurisdiction? *Credat Judaeus Apella, non ego*. All the frowns that may gather upon the brows of arrogance, will never persuade or frighten thinking people into a mistake so egregious, as to suppose for one serious moment, that the mere Synod is the church of Jesus Christ. To withdraw from the mere Synod, then, is not in itself withdrawal from the Redeemer's church. Even admitting all that has been said of the wickedness of apostacy from the church of God, and of the wrong of giving a man license to throw off his obligations to Jehovah, it cannot bear a feather's weight upon this question, until it is satisfactorily proved, that the church is the Synod; that what the Scriptures say of the church, they say of the Synod; and that submission to synodical jurisdiction is one of the essential and immutable terms of christian discipleship. For, if there may be true christianity, and true ministerial authority, without connection with synodical organizations, (as there was a century before Synods began, and as there is where Synods now have no jurisdiction,) then a worthy member of the Synod may claim an honorable dismissal without becoming liable to the charge of abandonment of the church, or apostacy to the ungodly world. This horned monster thus falls powerless at our feet.

II. It is said that, "no society can exist without an organization and controlling power;" that "the society of believers, which we call the church, must therefore also have a controlling power, which power decides in all cases of discipline and dismission;" and that therefore the Synod has power to refuse dismission to any of its members. We admit these premises, but reject the conclusion as a complete *non sequitur*. It takes for granted that the Synod is the organization and controlling power of the church, which is a matter neither included in the premises of this argument, nor in the Bible. The church was just as much a society before there were Synods, and where there are no Synods, as where we now find synodical establishments. The church has an organization, complete as the Divine hand could make it, and a controlling power as august as godhead, without the need of human devices to reduce it to what vain and fleshly wisdom may lay down as system and order. It has ever been the common failing of man to imagine, that if he had had the making of things in this world, he would have turned out a much more finished job than that which came from the hand of Deity; and hence we must have Synods to bring God's institutes to order, and their jurisdiction and arbitrary enactments put in the place of the church's Divine Lord and his inspired laws, thus to make a *real society* out of the chaotic particles which Jehovah, by a marked blunder, had before given out as a beautiful Divine community! When will mortals once finish correcting all God's mistakes? The church, by its very name, and from the very dawn of its being, is a society, and consequently has never been without organization and controlling power. Whatever the necessities of a society require, it has had from the very commencement; and yet Synods were not introduced for hundreds of years, and then only by human authority. To tell us, then, that Synods form the church's organic being, and by this right have the power to refuse dismission to their members, and to enforce obedience to their rules by the penalties of excommunication, is to set aside history, scripture, and fact, to dishonor the order instituted of God, and to assert principles which if true would hold the Pope of Rome secure in his pretended supremacy against all the reasoning and Scripture, that our antagonists may bring to bear upon it. For if, after two or three hundred years of the church's existence, mere men have the right to introduce synodical jurisdiction as part of its essential organization, they have an equal right to introduce any other sort of jurisdiction as equally essential. And if we are bound to submit to Synods because mere men have constituted them the

controlling power of the church, we are bound, for the same reason, to submit to the Pope. The truth is, there is no controlling power in the church but Christ; and no essential organization, but that which he ordained. What *man* has to do in the administration of church affairs, can and must be done only as Christ has directed. And hence, for the Synod, which is a mere human contrivance, to claim jurisdiction over a man, and to assert power to hold him to obedience to its rigid laws by the pains of degradation and excommunication, when he has violated no statute of his God, is a wicked tyranny which we pray for strength ever to resist.

III. It is said again, that an application for exemption from synodical rules, though conscientiously and solemnly made, cannot be granted as a right, because such an application may come in collision with the consciences of those to whom it is made, and the conscience of the individual must yield to the consciences of the dominant majority!—(See *Review*, vol. 6, p. 525.) So then, if any association of men shall conscientiously believe that they have authority over the reader's conscience, he has no right to claim exemption from their jurisdiction! Upon the same principle, a man in Turkey is bound of God to be a Mohamedan; for "the conscience of the solitary must yield to society—the one to the many!" Is not this a beautiful theory! Yet, to such miserable shifts are distinguished men driven in order to defend the synodical proceeding which we have felt bound to impugn.

IV. We are next told, that "in all cases of counsel and deliberation, the majority decides;" that "*the decision of a majority is an expression of God's will for all practical purposes*;" and that hence a man can claim no right to dismissal from the Synod against the will of the majority, without an infraction of the Divine will! Here we have again the old heathenish maxim, *vox populi, vox Dei*, making the will of the majority the supreme law, no matter how much God's word may be contradicted, or his institutes abridged or disgraced. The crucifixion of Christ was a matter of deliberation in a legally constituted council of the church; the majority decided that it should be done; accordingly they who crucified the Son of God were devoutly obedient servants of God, and did exactly their duty, by following the Divine will! The majority in the synagogues excommunicated the first disciples; those disciples were therefore excommunicated of God! Luther was anathematized by the majority of the church in which he was reared, and by the established authorities of that church,

therefore, Luther was accused of God! for "the decision of a majority is an expression of God's will for all practical purposes!!" To what endless absurdities would such a doctrine not conduct us? Apply it, for a moment, to the proceedings of the early Synods. "The first council," says Hilary of Poitiers, "ordained silence on the *homousion*; the second established it, and would have us speak; the third excused the fathers of the council, and pretends they took the word *ousia* simply; the fourth condemns them, instead of excusing them!"—(Quoted in *Locke's Com. pl. Book.*) And yet, in each of these councils, the majority expressed the will of God!!! Well may we exclaim with Hilary, "These are rare folks to unravel the secrets of heaven!" But more, if the dismissal of a man from the Synod is a matter of deliberation and counsel, and the decision of the majority expresses the will of God, then the majority may dismiss him to Judaism, Paganism, the world, or the devil, and it will be the will of God. But no, says our antagonist, the majority cannot so dismiss a man, because God has not given to them any such power. Very well, we reply, neither then can the majority compel a man to submit to synodical jurisdiction by the pains of degradation, without an expressed grant of power to that effect. If the absence of direct Divine authority disables the majority in the one case, the same absence of Divine authority must equally disable them in the other case. And as God has not given, either to the majority, or to the entire complement of the Synod, any such power in either case, so it is as much a usurpation, to attempt the one as to undertake the other. It is surprising how these formidable looking arguments crumble to ashes the very moment they are touched.

V. But again, it is argued, that a brother dare not be dismissed from the Synod, and exempted from obligation to synodical exactions, because "*positive precepts of the word of God are adverse to it.*" This we regard as a fair way to meet the question; and if such a case can be made out, by just laws of exegesis, we will agree to submit, and to retract all our preceding reasoning on the subject. But no such case has been made out; neither can it be. What are these positive precepts? Why, we are told, that Peter says, "submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake;" and that Paul says, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." Now, if our opponent understands these precepts in an absolute sense, they prove too much for his purpose. So understood, they would convict the men who uttered them of rebellion and treason, because they refused to be silent respect-

ing Jesus and the resurrection, as the Jewish authorities demanded of them; they would also prove the Reformers to have been great sinners against God, for so vigorously resisting the ecclesiastical powers of their day; and they would make it mortal sin for a man in a papal country not to be a papist, or for any one in anything to resist the injunctions and edicts of any existing establishment claiming judicatorial power. But he who has adduced these passages does not so understand them. "We freely concede," says he, "that they have a direct reference to civil institutions, and the preservation of good order and subjection in the state, and have no reference to Synods, as such." By his own concession, then, they do not demand subjection to synodical rules. As to "the spirit of these precepts" being "of universal application," that is true only of Divine institutions. Political power is ordained of God, and therefore we are to submit to it for the Lord's sake. Parental authority is of Divine appointment, and therefore we are required to be subject to it in the Lord. But synodical jurisdiction is not an ordinance of God, and therefore the injunction of submission does not here apply as in the other cases. 'To interpret what God has said of his own institutes as equally applicable to mere human establishments, is a singular way of ascertaining the Divine will.

But these are not all, it seems. For the Synod to exempt any one of its members from synodical exactions, it is said, "would violate the precept, 'bear ye one another's burdens;' and that other social precept, 'look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others;' and that other one, 'brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of meekness.'" Now, if any one can find aught in these passages in favor of enforcing submission to synodical jurisdiction by the penalty of rupturing a minister's relations to Christ and his church, we are entirely satisfied that it should be carefully noted without another word. But Jesus says of an offending brother, "If he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." We fancy we see this specially marked as a Divine settlement of the whole question. But look at it. "The case is that of *trespass*." The whole passage relates to an incorrigible offender—to one who has grievously transgressed and refuses to repent. Such a case, not only the Synod, but every congregation, and every christian has authority, and is enjoined of God to hold as one who has denied the faith. All this we have already shown. But what has the question before us to do with the case of a

persevering and irreclaimable transgressor? We are treating only of the rights and obligations of a virtuous, upright, and worthy minister of Jesus Christ. As to what the law is respecting wicked offenders and apostates, we have here no concern. What we are striving to ascertain is, whether ministerial authority depends on submission to arbitrary synodical laws; whether it is in the power of Synods to enforce submission to their jurisdiction by Divine sanctions; and whether God has made it necessary for a godly ambassador of Jesus to attend synodical meetings, or lose his heavenly commission. Absentation of one's self from the Synod is no sin. It transgresses no Divine law. It is no violation of any one's rights. It does not, therefore, come at all within the purview of the passage quoted. That *an offender* must hear the church so far as she speaks according to the inspired word, or be excommunicated, we all admit. But, that *an unoffending brother* must remain in the Synod, and punctually attend its sessions, or be deposed from his ministry, is quite a different doctrine, and one which receives no countenance from this or any other Scripture. The Bible *precepts*, then, fail our opponents, just as all their other arguments; and the action of the Synod of Maryland denying to a worthy brother a certificate of honorable dismission, whilst he was still required to attend its conventions, on pain of losing his standing and commission as a minister of Christ, stands forth as a naked piece of ecclesiastical arrogance and synodical usurpation.

VI. Once more; we are told that "the case of a minister's demanding, as his right, a dismissal in good standing, into the world, or the church at large, and sustained by the Synod, is unexampled in the history of the church in this country." Now as to dismission "*into the world*," we have nothing to say. Our question respects only exemption from synodical exactions as not vitiating ministerial authority. And that cases have occurred in the history of synodical transactions, which sustain the position we have taken, is unquestionable. We have already referred to the case of Gregory Nazianzen, and given the unflattering terms in which he expressed his purpose to attend no more Synods. But, even in that day, when Synods already claimed such high prerogatives in other things, they had not yet come to such a pitch as to think of disciplining or degrading him, either for his non-attendance, or for the disrespectful manner in which he spoke of Synods. "D.," of the Observer, admits that "within our bounds, there are men who were once Lutheran ministers, in charge of congregations, in regular synodical connection, that are now inde-

pendent;" and that *they were not* "excinded for their refusal to submit to church authority," as he calls it.—(See his first Art.) Dr. Hazelius tells us of a Rev. Mr. Daser, of South Carolina, who withdrew from the Synod—*Corpus Evangelicum*—"and remained unconnected with any clerical body till the time of his death;" and yet, no harsh proceedings were ever instituted to vex and trouble him; neither do we hear that any one ever thought of denying the validity and scripturalness of his ministry.—(*Am. Luth. Ch.* p. 152.) The same authority tells us of some members of the "*Synod of the West*," who asked and obtained honorable dismission, even when the Synod at the time expressed disapprobation of the object they had in view.—(p. 223.) Thus also, two members of the Synod of Virginia, (one in 1847, the other, we think, in 1838 or 9) were, at their own request, honorably dismissed, and that by the President *ad interim*, with the subsequent sanction of the Synod, although they had no thought of removing out of the bounds of that Synod, or of connecting elsewhere. A similar case has recently occurred in the Synod of East Pennsylvania. This argument thus also falls hopelessly to the ground.

VII. It is further said, that the effects of giving an honorable dismission to a worthy brother when demanded, would be disastrous. If one can claim dismissal, another can; "and consequently the society, (that is to say, the *Synod*), with all the blessings which it was designed and calculated to effect, would be destroyed." But, if we were even to admit all the unlikely suppositions included in this argument, and that the effect would be as represented, what of it? If there is not love, fraternity, and mutual sympathy enough among the members of the Synod to make them desire and continue such union and yearly intercourse with each other, the sooner it is disbanded the better. Christ desires no *forced* unions for the promotion of his kingdom; neither will he bless such. His work cannot prosper in the hands of unloving servants. If Synods will not hold together, and will not sufficiently recommend themselves to retain men in them by the force of that propriety and fraternity from which they sprung, let them dissolve and die; it will be no loss to genuine christianity. If internal cohesion will not preserve them, external coercion, based upon usurpation, cannot make anything good out of them. God made no provision for Synods. And if men now will hold them to be indispensable to the continuance and well-being of the church, and will insist on demanding submission to their jurisdiction, they make themselves wiser than Jehovah,

and proclaim themselves better legislators than the omniscient Jesus! And are there no evil consequences to be apprehended from such proceedings? No danger of incurring the indignation of God? No possibility of disturbing and sundering our congregations? The writer in the April Review sees endless mischiefs from the presence of half a dozen dismissed Lutheran ministers in the State of Maryland; but there is another state of things, on the opposite side, and *much more likely to occur*, to which he does not seem to have directed his attention. Suppose that the obnoxious measures which he defends should be pressed to extremities, and that twelve pastors of the Maryland Synod, with their congregations, should feel their consciences so agrieved as to consider themselves fully justified in violently sundering themselves from all connection with such innovators and exactors; what would be the consequences in that case? Would there be no contentions, no heart-burnings, no inconveniences, no disharmonies, no interruptions of order and quiet? And we put it to the consciences of our friends, which would be the worst, to agree once in twenty or fifty years, quietly to dismiss a member desiring to withdraw, or to assume the responsibility of rending the entire Synod into two opposing parties, occupying the same territory; and thus create a schism that may last an age? But,

Finally, we are told, that a minister must be held responsible; that "an irresponsible position in the church is as dangerous for the minister as for the members of the church;" and that hence a man dare not demand an honorable dismissal from the Synod without connecting with some other. Certainly, the ministry is not an irresponsible office. It must be regarded in its inception and in its prosecution. "*Lay hands suddenly on no man*," is a Divine injunction, which applies to every case of induction into the holy office. And, "*if any man preach any other gospel, let him be accursed*;" is a requirement which God himself has laid upon his universal church. But these sacred demands give no more power to Synods than they give to congregations and to individual christians. Whether there be connection with the Synod, or no such connection, the minister is equally responsible. First of all, he is directly responsible to the Divine Head and Lord of the church. Secondly, he is responsible to his congregation, of which he forms a part. Thirdly, he is responsible to every individual christian, who also is authorized of God to banish from his house any who bring not with them the doctrine of Christ. And finally, he is responsible to public christian opinion, which is the most potent control that operates

upon him, next to the revealed will of his God. Who ever thinks of the rules of his Synod in the great work of his ministry? How many members of the Synod know or care what its constitution is? A true man of God is governed and moved by holier and higher considerations. He is kept to the path of duty and propriety by more weighty and sublime influences than those of synodical enactments. To say that our ministers are orthodox and virtuous, only or chiefly because the Synod requires these things of them, is a foul slander upon their piety, and if true, would be a disgrace the most shocking, and a stigma which nothing could wipe off. Well has Barrow said, "He that only can be scared and scourged to duty, scarce deserveth the name of a man."—(*Vol. 1, p. 601.*) And if our ministers are upright and dutiful only by reason of synodical compulsions, the sooner they are thrown loose from such constraints, that their hypocrisy may appear and meet its deserved reward, the better for them and for the church. Every virtuous man will scorn the idea that his ministerial character and fidelity are in any way dependent upon synodical jurisdiction. If a man's solemn vows to Almighty God, and his amenability for his acts and life to the solemn judgment of God, and his own personal sense of right, and the powerful weight of public christian sentiment, will not keep him in the path of righteousness, it is puerility to think of keeping him there by synodical rules. If he is a perjured hypocrite, he will remain one in spite of Synods. And if the object of the arbitrary retention of a minister under synodical jurisdiction is, to prevent him from injuring the churches, and from leading astray our people, the Synod can do no more with him if they should retain him, than if they should dismiss him. The sentence of the Synod is nothing more than *declarative* at best. All that it can do with an unworthy man is to declare him, in its judgment, unfit to be recognized as a minister, and to warn christians against him. It has no physical chains to bind him or the people who may determine to adhere to him. And precisely the same declaration and warning may be given respecting any ministerial transgressor upon its territory, whether he be a member of the Synod or not. If a brother who has been honorably dismissed should afterwards fall away from virtue and the truth, the Synod may still say of him just what it would say if he were a member, and utter the same admonitory cautions to the churches. And if the mere declarations of the Synod would reach him in the one case, they would not fail to reach him in the other. In either case, if he should refuse to hear the Synod, and can gain followers, what can the

Synod do, but let him alone in the hands of that God who will judge him? There is responsibility—responsibility which God himself has laid upon all his ministers—and which none can throw off. But it is not responsibility to synodical jurisdiction, any more than to every christian man or congregation. If God has instituted or authorized synodical judicatories, to which his ambassadors must be subject or lose their office, the record of it may be found in his word, and we have a right to demand its production that we may see and examine it, before allowing to any such establishments the right of lordship over us. But no such record has been produced; and no such record can be produced. And in the absence of such a record, all the reasonings in the world cannot make it manifest, that a man cannot be a true minister of Jesus Christ without submission to the arbitrary rules of human synodical organizations. We conclude, therefore, that a minister's right to an honorable dismissal from the Synod, whenever he shall feel bound in conscience to demand it, stands unshaken; and that the Synod which denies it to him, if in good standing, undertakes the exercise of despotic powers which God has not given, and which squint strongly towards papal assumptions and the Romish inquisition.

CONCLUSION.

There are still other points relating to this question to which we have not space to advert. But we have gone far enough to show its general nature, bearings and merits. And in view of what has been said, we now charge the proceedings of the Synod of Maryland in the matter before us, with an assumption of power over the ministerial commission, which is unauthorized either in reason or in revelation. We charge it with an unlawful undertaking to degrade a worthy ambassador of Jesus Christ for a cause which Jehovah does not recognize. We charge it with an attempt to invest a mere human and voluntary confederation with prerogatives and arbitrary judicatorial powers, contrary to the whole tenor of evangelical christianity. We charge it with endeavoring to introduce mere commandments of men as belonging to the essential constituents of the church of God. We charge it with asserting claims to synodical judicature, such as have enslaved and despoiled the church in former ages, and which the Lutheran fathers in America never designed to have existence among us. We charge it with venturing to set up a human lordship over the consciences of God's ministers and people, which is repugnant to the Gospel, dangerous to our covenant rights, and utterly

without foundation in the Scriptures of truth. And we ask, as we shall all answer in the dreadful judgment, whether this is to be tolerated in our free evangelical Lutheran church, in this free land?

We repeat again, that we have no wish to discontinue the custom of annual synodical conventions. Though they have been often and greatly abused, they have also been, and may still be instruments of great usefulness to the cause of God. We most devoutly and earnestly long for fraternal union and coöperation among all the members of our growing Lutheran family. We ardently wish and pray for peace and harmony. But, to purchase peace at the expense of honesty and truth, or to go with the brethren contrary to conscience and God's revealed will, is what none have a right to ask of us. The whole history of the church shows a constant tendency to unwarranted assumptions of power on the part of those who have had its interests in more especial charge, and how prone is even the smallest usurpation to grow and spread. "Encroaching," says Plutarch, "is an innate disease of potencies." Any pretence will serve to ground attempts to enlarge power; and every accession prepares the way for still further amplifications. It never moves backwards, except when violent revolutions set it back. Spiritual power especially, is of such a nature as to be of the most subtle and rapid growth. It has a special awe upon the heart and conscience. It makes those tremble who would resist it, lest they should be fighting against God. It is therefore less liable to obstructions than other forms of power, and fastens itself upon the throne of dominion before men are aware of it. So it has been; and, whilst the seeds of popery, with which men are born, remain operative in human nature, so it will ever be. Less than one hundred years ago, our Lutheran fathers debated it as an open question, whether they should even continue the yearly meetings of pastors and delegates for mutual consultation and advice. Their children now wish to demand that every minister must attend these meetings or be disrobed of his office? And to concede this would only prepare the way for some further abridgment of former liberty. We therefore feel bound to call attention to these proclivities towards arbitrary dictatorial power in our synodical conventions, and to do what we can to guard and stay the church against such encroachments. In their legitimate province, as free conventions for mutual counsel, deliberation, and advice, let Synods be continued, and receive all due respect. But, if a sincere and deserving brother

cannot look upon them, as we look upon them, and feels that he cannot go with us in upholding them, let us not refuse to him the hand of fraternal recognition, nor think to disgrace and degrade him simply, because he cannot be satisfied to walk exactly in the path, in which we go forward with the solemn and momentous commission which the great God has given into our hands.

For taking this stand, upon this question, we have been charged with ambition, pride, selfishness, and a contemptible desire for display. We are not surprised at this, although it is known to the Omniscient Searcher of hearts that we have been actuated with no such motives. Truth has ever met with a surly reception at the seats of power. But truth is truth, whatever contumely may be heaped upon its advocates; and it will live on, no matter what efforts may be made to crush it. It may pass through fire, and flood, and tempest, but will remain as fresh, fair, and beautiful as ever. It needs no fleshly wisdom, nor worldly policy, to give it power, or to gain it victory. It is built upon the rock of ages. It is linked to the throne and to the eternal mind of God. It is therefore as immortal and immutable as Jehovah himself. Its days are the years of God. Its strength is like the right hand of omnipotence. And its defenders, no matter how circumvented or defamed, feel as if sustained by the granite framework of the mountains, girded by the everlasting hills.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATION OF THE CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH TO THE CHURCH.

THE church of God, on the earth, is one great visible society, formed by God himself, for his own glory, for the highest welfare of the members of the church and of the world. Our symbols define the church to be "the congregation of believers, in which the gospel is rightly preached, and the sacraments are rightly administered." This church is called *visible*, to distinguish it from the invisible church, which is composed only of those who are the true children and the elect of God. In the *creed*, it is called *Catholic*, because it embraces all of every nation, throughout the world, who profess the true religion. It is also called *holy*, inasmuch as it is separate from the world

and consecrated to God. If then, the question be asked what is the *church*? the answer is, "a society, one, great, visible, holy, catholic, in which the gospel is rightly preached, and the sacraments are rightly administered."

THE CHURCH ONE IN ALL AGES.

We have asserted that the church is the creature of God, and that the end of its existence is his glory. It existed anterior to the advent of the Son of God on the earth, and it must have been wide-spread and powerful in its influence, for on the day of Pentecost "there were dwelling, at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven." These were the descendants of Abraham, the covenanted seed of the father of the faithful, and not only these, but all who received the seal of the covenant in their flesh, whether regenerated or not, were reputed members of the church. No matter how far they wandered into distant lands, or where they erected their synagogues, they were the worshippers of the God of Israel, and made up but one church.

But it may be objected, that the Jewish church no longer exists, it has been cut off, and the unhappy Jews have been disinherited, they are a hissing and bye-word, and a reproach among all nations. This but confirms the position of the oneness of the church, for they could not be cast out of any other than the church visible. The fact, therefore, of their rejection, as a matter of history, and referred to by the apostle Paul to the Romans, as an argument addressed to the Gentiles, proves the existence of the church, and the privilege of connection with her. The existence of the church, surrounded and embarrassed by the restrictions of the Mosaic ceremonies was, from the nature of the case, only preparatory to a more extended influence, for these restrictions unfitted her for universality. But, when these local and temporary restrictions were removed, she was prepared for a dispensation which would embrace all time and all people. Now, the ancient people of God were not cut off until the Gentiles were taken in, together with all those Jews who received the Lord Jesus Christ as their Messiah. To employ the beautiful and apposite illustration of the apostle Paul, "the good olive tree, the church, planted by God, continued to exist and flourish. The natural branches, the Jews, were cut off, because of their unsoundness. The branches of an olive tree, wild by nature, the Gentiles, were grafted in, and partook of the root and fatness of the good olive tree." Thus the visible church, as an organized whole, subsisted after the abolition of the Jewish dispensation, and

the commencement of the christian economy, among the Gentile christians. Now if any one deny the existence of the church, at the point of transition from the old to the new dispensation, it will be necessary for him to sustain his denial by showing how, and where, and by whom the church was blotted out. Has God said that it should come to an end, and does history confirm the truth of the declaration? Nothing of all this; and therefore the visible, one church continues, having in the good providence of God adapted itself, under the light and liberty of the new dispensation, to the necessities of the whole world. So that now, it is no longer at Jerusalem that God is to be worshipped, nor does he there only manifest himself, but everywhere, in all nations, he dwells with his people, writes his law upon their hearts, and is their God.

2. The church is one, because the condition of church membership and of acceptance by God, is one in all ages. That condition is faith. In all the changes of economy through which the church has passed, faith is either distinctly stated, or evidently implied, as the bond of union between the church and her exalted head. Indeed, we cannot conceive of such a union, without this element which, on the part of the believer, disposes him to receive the communications of the founder of the church, with implicit confidence; and leads him to rest, securely, in the perfections of his character and the dispensations of his providence; whilst it furnishes a reason, seen in the believer, why God should regard him as morally prepared to receive those gifts and graces which he is disposed to bestow, and which he has promised to all those who possess this qualification. If we lay the foundations of the church in our first parents after the fall, faith is the implied condition of acceptance there. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." A descendant of the woman, seduced by the old serpent, the devil, shall arise, who will destroy his power, and bind him in indissoluble bonds. The reception of this great truth ministered consolation. It was a looking forward to a deliverer who would appear, in due time, and to a deliverance from the dreadful consequences of disobedience, and to a state of complete emancipation from the power and pollution of sin. If we connect Enoch and Noah, and those who possessed a character similar to theirs, with the church, faith is the bond of connection here also. For Enoch walked with God, and "Noah, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house." If we begin the church with Abraham, from whom and his family only, we can indeed find the traces of the church as a society, faith and its accompaniment, jus-

tification, are clearly defined, for Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews contains a catalogue of worthies, all of whom believed unto justification, which brings the history of faith in its connection with the church, down to the introduction of the christian dispensation, which was inaugurated by John the baptizer, and was established upon Christ, the chief corner stone.

From this period, the subject of faith receives a more distinct and definite form. The gospel is preached. The offers of mercy are made to the rebellious, and reception into the favor of God is conditioned upon faith. The commission given to the apostles reads thus: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here then, in this last age of the church, in which the Son of God was manifest in the flesh, and the Holy Ghost was poured out without measure, are required the same moral qualifications for admission into the church as in the incipency of the society. Through the changing scenes of four thousand years, in which the face of nature, and the face of society, have been completely revolutionized, the church, in her essential features, has remained the same. Her founder, her head, her protector and guide changes not.

3. We infer the oneness of the church from the prophecies and promises of the old dispensation fulfilled in the new, or unfulfilled to this day. These have respect especially to Christ and the blessings of salvation. For example, Jacob, in his predictions concerning his posterity, declares "that the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Now, it is conceded on all hands, that the reference here is to Christ and the government of the tribe of Judah, the descent of Christ from this tribe, and the subjugation of the Jewish people to a foreign nation. Moses announced unto the children of Israel this great truth: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." This was the prophet looked for by the people, when they inquired of the baptizer, "art thou that prophet?" Thus the Psalmist exclaims, in the second Psalm, "why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, &c." The whole Psalm having reference to the conspiracies of Herod, Pilate,

and the Jewish rulers against our blessed Lord. Now, these predictions evidently proceed upon the supposition that the church, as one and visible, was to continue beyond the Jewish dispensation, inasmuch as there is distinct provision made for the transition to the christian and evangelical. The sixtieth chapter of Isaiah, which contains a description of the future glories of the church, does clearly imply oneness and unlimited perpetuity. The church is represented as a kingdom—kings are nursing fathers, and queens are nursing mothers. The Gentiles, the isles and the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto her, &c. How could this be, unless the church were one and visible. Christ is called a king, and his church a kingdom. Now, in the language of another, "the very idea of a kingdom proves that his church is one, that she is visible, and that this visible unity is one of her essential attributes. If you cut her up into ten thousand pieces, there is no more a kingdom. If you strip her of visible form, you withdraw her from the eyes of men altogether, and shut her up in impenetrable secrecy. Where then is her light? Where her testimony? Where the use of those cautions, precepts, encouragements, which are adapted to her state as visible, and have no meaning in any other application?"

Equally striking are the predictions concerning the hardenedness of the Jews, in the time of Christ—the minute prophecies, and their complete fulfilment concerning the incarnation, birth, character, life, sufferings and death, &c., of the Son of God, as also the promise of the spirit, and the glorious consequences of his general effusion. Now, the fulfilling of a promise to an individual or society, supposes the existence of that individual or society, both when the promise was made, and when it was fulfilled. The promise, for example, "I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring; and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses, &c.," could not have been fulfilled, if Israel had perished. The fact then, that God is now fulfilling, and will fulfil hereafter, promises given to the visible church, ages ago, establishes her perpetuity and identity.

This point will be made more clear, by a reference to the language of the New Testament. It is an admitted law of scriptural interpretation, that the language of inspiration, in the clearer light of the New Testament, must be received in explanation of what is obscure in the Old. Now the writers of the New Testament never attempt to prove that there is a one catholic, visible church. Neither do they speak of it as originating with them; but, they assume its existence, and

never intimate that they suspect any one of doubting its existence. This, however, they do repeatedly ; they reprobate the idea of division, and condemn those who cause schisms, as rending the body of Christ, which is one. Thus Stephen, in his speech before the Sanhedrim, refers to the prophet, like unto Moses, whom God should raise up unto their brethren, and then adds : "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sinai, &c." The whole discourse recognizes the church as one, from the beginning until the time of the speaker. So likewise Saul is said to have made havoc of *the church*. Paul confesses that he persecuted *the church of God* ; and of the converts it was said, there were added daily to *the church*, of such as are saved. The only comment which we make on these passages is, that they cannot, by any legitimate use, be made to apply to any other than the one, visible, catholic church of God. The oneness of the church is farther illustrated, by the terms which are applied to her. She is called "the kingdom of heaven." This must mean but *one*, or else it would not be a kingdom, or the kingdom, but several. She is called a *body*, the body of Christ, of which Christ is the head, and believes the different members, with their varied offices. She is called a *household*, and *the household of God*, a building, a holy temple in the Lord, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. We need dwell no longer on this point, inasmuch as there seems to be no escaping the conclusion that the church of the Old and the New Testament can be no other than the one, visible, catholic church. We might indeed multiply proof, and by an inverted order, show the absurdity of any other position than the one which we have assumed. But this will suffice.

COVENANTS.

A covenant, amongst men, is an agreement between two parties who are, or are presumed to be, so far as the agreement is involved, on an equality. Both parties, from the nature of the case, are presumed to be able to fulfil their respective parts of the contract. Whilst this equality cannot even be presumed, in the covenants which God has made with his visible church, yet God does condescend to the infirmities of his people, and makes promises, and ratifies them with oaths, that their faith may be firm, and their consolations may abound. These covenants are promises, with conditions annexed, which are proposed only by God himself, and therefore partake of the

nature of a law, for they cannot be neglected, or rejected with impunity. Of this nature is the covenant made with our first parents, commonly called the covenant of works, and that made with Noah and his posterity, and all the creatures in the ark, that the earth should not again be destroyed by a flood. The token of this covenant is the bow in the cloud, a perpetual token of the presence and the power of God. We can find no visible organized church, anterior to the calling of Abraham. From the present time to that, we can follow the traces of the church, but no farther. The church is visible with us, it was so to our fathers and to their fathers, up to the evangelical dispensation. It was visible to the apostles and their fathers, up through the prophets and Moses and the patriarchs. But here we lose all trace of its prior existence, and therefore date the beginning of the visible church with the calling of the father of the faithful. The covenants with Abraham are of a twofold character, viz: the one having reference to the patriarch himself and his family, and the other extending its influence to all the families of the earth. These will be found recorded in Genesis, twelfth chapter, and second and third verses. "I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." These promises are repeated at different times, and the subsequent communications seem to be only the repetitions of these two with modifications. In chapter 12: 7, and chapter 13: 14, 17, and in chapter 15: 1, the promise of a numerous offspring and great worldly honor is repeated. The promise, as recorded in the fifteenth chapter, is remarkable as occurring when the patriarch was well advanced in years, and yet was childless, and, though waiting for so many years the fulfilment of the promise, he staggered not at the apparent obstacles in the way of its accomplishment, but glorified God by his steadfast faith, and it was counted to him for righteousness. This covenant was ratified by the slain animals divided into two parts, and "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp" passing between them, the symbol of the divine presence. This covenant secured to Abraham a numerous posterity, and their inheritance in the land of Canaan. How faithfully the promise made by God was fulfilled, the history of the children of Israel shows. The covenant, having respect to the blessings which should come upon all the families of the earth, is distinctly set forth and ratified with its seal, in the first fourteen verses of the seventeenth chapter of Genesis. This covenant was made

fourteen years after the first, and can be regarded neither as a covenant of grace, nor yet of works, for Abraham had been justified by faith without works, in the covenant of grace before this. Nor can it be viewed as a covenant formed for the purpose of adding dignity to the person or family of the patriarch. These had all been secured before; and although these are again alluded to, yet the great point seems to be the establishment of new relations, and in an extraordinary manner. For example, *I will make thee a father of many nations*; is much more than can be affirmed of Abraham's literal posterity. The patriarch's name is changed, as is that of his wife, because they are elevated to a new dignity. All the families of the earth are to be blessed in him, and not only this great honor, but he is to be the instrument in such a manner as no other man ever did or could become the father of many nations. If we inquire how he became such a blessing, the apostle Paul, Gal. 3: 16, 17, informs us, when he is establishing the position that we are justified by faith and not by works. "Now to Abraham and to his seed were the promises made. He saith not of seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect." The covenant then embraces not only Isaac and Jacob, partakers of like faith with Abraham, but all of every nation also, who should choose their God, their faith, and their society. The seal of this covenant was circumcision, by which the people of God were cut off from the rest of the world, having entered into a new relationship with him, and established upon new and glorious promises. Abraham commenced at once to introduce into this covenant, not only himself and his natural descendants, but his servants, bought with money, as well as born in his house. Upon the same principle did his posterity act under the law. The stranger who desired to keep the passover, was required, first, to circumcise all his males, and then he became as one born in the land; i. e., he was, to all intents and purposes, under the full operation of the covenant established with Abraham and his seed. The extended application of this covenant is made clear to us by the author of the epistle to the Romans, chap. 4: 11, 12. "And he (Abraham) received the sign of circumcision; a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the *father* of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised;

that righteousness might be imputed to them also; and the *father* of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, yet being uncircumcised." Here the circumcision and the uncircumcision evidently embrace the two great classes of men, which constitute the family of man, and plainly point out, as illustrated in the subsequent history of the church, that this covenant was intended to embrace in it all those who would exercise like faith with father Abraham, no matter from what nation descended, and thus he would be the father of many nations. The rite of circumcision was the seal of this covenant. Now, whatever value some men may attach to rites and external ordinances, the importance of this rite was such, that he who neglected it, or refused to perform it, was cut off from the people of God, and excluded from the blessings connected with the covenant. The same misfortune came upon the man-child whose parents neglected this seal of the covenant. They were all regarded as having broken the covenant of their God. Two things seem to have been set forth by this rite, and confirmed, viz: 1, 'That the natural descendants of Abraham, who had this seal of the covenant in their flesh, were entitled to all the benefits which were immediately derivable from it. 2, That it was a seal of the righteousness of faith which Abraham had, being yet uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also. Rom. 4: 11. This shows that the doctrine and the privilege of the righteousness of faith were to be perpetuated among his seed, by the operation of God's covenant with him; that the justification of the sinner is by faith alone, righteousness being imputed to them that believe, and that they only who believe become, in the highest sense, the children of Abraham, and are blessed with him. The seal, therefore, was twofold, viz: a seal of God's covenant with Abraham and with his seed, who were circumcised in consequence of their natural connection with him; and a seal to all who exercised like faith with Abraham, of their personal interest in the same righteousness by which he was justified. In this connection, and as a conclusion to this part of the argument, we quote the apposite words of another. "From these general premises, the conclusion is direct and irrefragable, that the covenant with Abraham was designed to assure the accomplishment of the second great promise made to him, while he was yet in Ur of the Chaldees; and that the effect of it was to bring him and his family, with all who should join them in

a kindred profession, *into a church estate*, i. e., was a *covenant ecclesiastical*, by which Jehovah organized the visible church, as one distinct spiritual society; and according to which, all his after dealings with her were to be regulated. Hitherto she had been scattered, and existed in detached parts. Now it was the gracious intention of God to reduce her into a compact form, that she might be prepared for the good things to come, and her own more extended usefulness. Since Abraham was designated as the man from whom the Messiah was to spring; since he had signally glorified the Lord's veracity, not staggering at his promise through unbelief, he selected this, his servant, as the favored man in whose family he would commence the organization of that church in which he designed to perpetuate the righteousness of faith. With this church, as with *a whole*, composed in the first instance of Abraham's family, and to be increased afterwards by the addition of all such as should own his faith, was the covenant made. This is that covenant after which we are inquiring." Now this covenant was never annulled, neither by the introduction of a new covenant, nor by the changes of dispensation through which the church passed. If there be a new covenant, where is it? Who will point it out? The introduction of the Mosaic law did not supersede it, as is manifest from Paul's argument touching the permanency of this covenant. Gal. 3: 15, 16, 17. Neither has the christian dispensation, in any respects, vitiated its character. Indeed, it has only developed its character, and fully carried out its provisions. For as has already been intimated, the dispensation of the law, from its restricted and exclusive character, could not carry out, to their full extent, the designs of this covenant. For, until the christian dispensation, Abraham could not be the father of many nations. This the apostle clearly establishes, when he states, writing on the subject of the law and this covenant, Gal. 3: 14, "*That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ*: that we might receive the promise of the spirit through faith." This whole subject, however, is settled by the remarks already made concerning the oneness of the church. If any one, therefore, affirm that this covenant has been annulled, or superseded, the burden of the proof devolves upon him. We close this topic, then, with the remark that believers existed before the flood and subsequently, with no visible bond of union or church connection. To carry forward the purposes of God, in reference to those who loved him, the visible church was organized in the family of Abraham, and his covenant, with the seal annexed, was made with the patriarch. The cov-

enant, from its nature, was unchanging and everlasting. The church passed through various dispensations, adapted to the circumstances in which she was placed, until the incarnation of the Son of God, who was the end of the ceremonial dispensation and of prophecy, when the last age of the world was inaugurated by the general outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the conversion of sinners unto God, bringing with it a degree of intelligence and all-embracing love, through which all the promises of the covenant may be fulfilled.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHURCH.

As the church, from the terms of the covenant by which it was instituted, was designed to bestow its blessings upon all the families of the earth, there could be, from the nature of the case, but two modes of perpetuating the church. The one, from those who did not belong to the family of the patriarch, and the other, from those who did. The one, by a profession of faith, receiving the seal of the covenant, and the other, by simply receiving the seal as the profession, was involved in the very condition of their birth. These two modes were recognized and practised from the beginning, and continue until this day. They who were not participants of the blessings of the covenant, (i. e.) were not members of the church, were called *strangers, foreigners, aliens, afar off*, and must continue such until they come to the knowledge of the truth. The same language is employed by the apostle Paul under the new dispensation, Eph. 2: 11, 12, 13, &c. No Jew nor Gentile can become a member of the church, without repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Is a profession of this state of mind sufficient, or does the church demand the reality? On this subject there are two extremes, one satisfied with a general profession of religion, and the other demanding religious experience as the only test of admission into the church. If the former were deemed sufficient, then the mere declaration, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ," repeated by rote, expressing, in the mouth of the professor, no intelligible signification, and unsustained by a corresponding life, would be a passport into the church and the body of Christ, and might become an instrument for the promotion of ignorance and sin, instead of being the light and salt of the earth. If the latter be made the rule, it seems to be almost impossible to avoid extravagance. Thousands have been admitted into the church upon no other ground than their *feelings*, although unable to give any rational account of their feelings, or of the plan of salvation. Others would make doctrinal soundness,

without a strict scrutiny into character, the test; and others again, would be satisfied with external morals and doctrinal correctness. Our Savior has settled the difficulty, and given us a rule, viz: "By their fruits shall ye know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Doing the will of God implies a knowledge of God and of his will. We would interpret the language of our Lord then to mean, *a knowledge of the leading doctrines of Christianity, an open avowal of faith in the Redeemer's name, the ability to give an account of the hope which is entertained, connected with the diligent and faithful discharge of the duties which we owe to God and man.* To require more than this, would seem to transcend the power which God has given to the church for her own safety and usefulness; less than this is opening the door for the introduction of unsoundness of doctrine, and ungodliness of practice, into the most holy places on the earth. Too much care cannot be employed, lest on the one hand the diffident and timid be discouraged, and on the other, the standard of religious attainment be too low, and the church fail to elevate, as she ought, those who are to be the lights of the world.

The question now arises of great importance, and certainly too little investigated, viz: does the church, in receiving adults into her membership, proceed upon the principle that she is able to discover their real character, and that they actually are before God, as they appear before man? Certainly not. The church is visible, and therefore cannot make that which is invisible a test of visible communion. God only searches the heart and tries the reins. The best critics of character are deceived. Men are deceived in themselves as much as in others. To maintain, therefore, that the reality of conversion is the reason of admission to church privileges, is to lay down a rule which can never be applied. Yet how some men think, and reason, and write, on the subject, may be seen from the accounts which our religious newspapers give of the number of conversions, as the result of this and that series of meetings. The writer, in making this remark, would guard against any improper inferences from it, as though he were opposed to an increase of religious meetings, when the circumstances require it, or revivals of pure and undefiled religion. All that we can judge from is, that which is visible, the fruit of the spirit, of the lips and of the life. The apostles were deceived. Simon Magus, Annanias and Sapphira, Alexander the coppersmith, and many others, were members of the church, and so was

Judas Iscariot. These facts, together with the parable of the tares, and the fishes, are significant on this point. False professions may be made, as they have been, and continue to be, and they can be met only by the faithful preaching and discipline of the house of God. So long as the real character is concealed, the society is uninjured. So soon as the obliquities of character become visible, a wholesome discipline will rectify the evil. The truth thus brought forth, on this subject, ought to put to the blush those would be wise men of the world who, when a professed believer falls into sin, charge the evil upon christianity and the church. Whereas, they themselves make greater mistakes every day, in their judgments of character. At the same time, the lovers of Christ and his cause, should understand that their only conservative power consists in the faithful application of the Savior's rule of admission into the church, and a conscientious and fearless administration of the rules of discipline against offenders. To return from this digression. The Jewish church did not receive many additions to her communion, by the admission of adult professors. It was principally by the second mode of admission that she increased, which we now proceed to consider. Hereditary descent is the principal mode of perpetuating the visible church. The relations and benefits of the covenant are the birthright of every child born of parents who are themselves believers, or church members. The language of the covenant is, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and *thy seed after thee, in their generations*, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." Gen. 17: 7. The meaning of which is, that as soon as a new individual is generated from this seed, he is within the covenant, and God is his God. So the Jews understood it, and put upon their offspring, when eight days old, the seal of the covenant by which they were cut off from all idol worship and heathen abominations, and consecrated to Jehovah. This falls in with God's ordinary dealings with men. The children are uniformly counted with their parents. Whatever covenant is made with the parents, extends to their children, whether it involve blessings or curses. The posterity of Adam are involved in all the fearful consequences of his transgression. The bow of promise is the sign to all his posterity, as it was to Noah himself, that the earth should not again be destroyed by a flood. What reason then, can be given why God should depart from his uniform course, in his covenant with his visible church? Is he not true and faithful? Is not his language to his people of the most tender and affectionate kind? Can they not trust in

him? If they cannot confide in him, in whom can they have confidence? No, he cannot deceive. We will trust in him, though he slay us. Children, therefore, are now members of the visible church, as they were under the Old Testament dispensation. No reason can be assigned, why children should be included in the covenant in Abraham and Moses, and not in Christ. There are additional reasons why, independently of all other considerations, children should be partakers of all the blessings of the covenant of God with his church. They share in all the calamities of the church. No fierce persecution of the people of God, whether in ancient or modern times, in which the children were not the principal sufferers. We have read church history to little purpose, if we have not discovered, in the persecutions of the Waldenses and Albigenses, and of the christian church in all ages, that the children were the chief sufferers: and the faithfulness of a covenant keeping God is seen in nothing more clearly than in the preservation of a spiritual seed, on the earth, in the midst of the wrath of the enemy. Besides, under the christian dispensation, the Great Head of the church has directed a special message to the children of the church, when he said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." More than this, if children are excluded from the church, then it will follow that, from the time of their natural until their spiritual birth, they are no more to the church than the heathen. We might ask, with such an alternative before us, of what value is the church to the children, when she discards and rejects them? And of what value, under such circumstances, would the church be to the world, inasmuch as children constitute the mass of her population. Such conduct towards the children would be as unnatural and unfeeling as that of a certain hyperorthodox supralapsarian congregation, amongst whom it was regarded sinful to teach the children to pray, because it was not certain that they belonged to the elect, and none but the elect ought to pray.

Moreover, God has confirmed the truth of the position which we have taken, by his dealings with his church in his ordinary providence. He has gathered his true worshippers from among the children of believing parents, and ordinarily in their youth. This is seen in the congregations, where especial attention is bestowed upon the young, in Sabbath Schools, where teachers are faithful, and in the household, where God is honored. Such congregations have been blessed. Truth has been mighty. The spirit of God convinced of sin and regenerated the

young, and precious seasons of spiritual refreshing were experienced; whereas, God frowned upon the congregations which neglected the young. Spirituality waned and expired. The aged members of the church went to their rest, and there were none to occupy their places, until, not only piety, but the congregation itself, expired. The feeble remnants of churches which pursued this suicidal and sinful course, are yet to be seen, scattered here and there in the church, obstinate in their stupidity, and hastening to certain extinction. The conclusion then is certain. The infant seed of the church is holy unto the Lord, and is a partaker of the covenant. Whatever privileges it had in ancient times it must have now. Membership it had in ancient times, therefore it has membership now. Indeed, if an argument can be deduced from a darker to a brighter dispensation, from a narrow and restricted one to that which is free, and offers its blessings to all, we must infer that the interests of the children of the church would be more completely secured, under the expansiveness and spirituality of the christian dispensation, than under any other which had preceded it.

It cannot but be regarded as a great calamity, that the church in any of its branches had ever departed from this original, primitive idea of the relation of the children to the church. Why should adult members of the church ever entertain the notion that children, and their own children, are the enemies of God. That they should be regarded as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, and without God in the world? Surely Peter settled this whole difficulty in his Pentecostal discourse, when he repeated and interpreted the terms of the covenant, viz: "For the promise is to you and to *your children*, and to *all that are afar off*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Here the apostle urges upon those whom he is addressing out of so many different nations, Jews and Gentiles, to accept of the rich blessings presented in Christ; blessings predicted by the prophets, and the fulfilment of the promises made to Abraham, designed for you Jews and your children, and for you Gentiles who are *afar off*, and whom God is now calling in Christ.

An objection may be raised against this whole discussion, and the conclusions at which we have arrived, from the fact that the seal of the covenant has been changed, and therefore there is a vitiation of the covenant and of all the blessings connected with it. But if our reasoning is correct, concerning the origin and the oneness of the church, then any difficulty concerning the imitating seal is obviated by the admitted right of

the founder of the church and of the covenant to change the seal when it may please him. Amongst men this is common. Besides, the nature of the seal, one would suppose, ought to partake of the character of the dispensation. The form of the dispensation does not change the nature of the covenant, neither, therefore, does the form of the seal vitiate the promise. When, therefore, our blessed Lord commanded his apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, *baptizing in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, he did as certainly constitute baptism the seal of the covenant, under the New Testament, as circumcision had been the seal under the old. As the one was applicable to adults and infants, so is the other, and, as the one impressed upon its subject the mark by which it is set apart as belonging to God, so does the other; both representing and sealing to the worthy recipient all the blessings of the covenant; both pointing out and being the means of obtaining the justification and the holiness which are secured by faith in Christ, and obedience to his law, and both, therefore, in every respect, expressing the same great truth, and subserving the same great end. Since then the one has ceased, and the other continues, the only conclusion remaining is, that the one has come into the place of the other. Baptism, therefore, has succeeded, and occupies the place of circumcision.

These two rites, in their oneness of signification and value, are brought together by the apostle Paul, Col. 2: 11, 12; in which he is discussing the completeness of the believer in Christ, viz: "In whom also ye are *circumcised with the circumcision* made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by *the circumcision of Christ*; buried with him *in baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Here both rites are viewed as signs of spiritual mercies. Circumcision is the sign of the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh. Evidently the result of faith and looking to Christ. Baptism is a burial by faith, and a resurrection by faith to newness of life. No one but a prejudiced sectarian could pervert this language, expressive of spiritual attainments, and apply it to the mode of baptism. To the Romans 4: 11, the same apostle writes concerning circumcision, that it was a seal of the righteousness of the faith which Abraham had, being yet uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also." Peter

confirms all this, and adds yet more to the inquirers on the day of Pentecost, when he preached "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Here Paul says that righteousness is imputed to them that believe, though they be *not circumcised*. Is the seal of no value, or is the period contemplated by the writer when circumcision would cease to be the sign? Certainly the latter. Whilst Peter, preaching to the first converts under the new dispensation, exhorts them to be baptized, (i. e.) to receive the seal of their covenant relationship to Jesus Christ. What can we say then, to these truths staring us in the face, other than that baptism has superseded circumcision, and is to be applied to the infant seed of the church, as was the rite which has now been displaced. The objection, therefore, derived from the change of the seal, has no force. It will be observed that the children of believing, or professing parents, are recognized as born members of the church, and baptism is based upon their membership, and not membership upon baptism. Baptism then, is the sign and the seal of the blessings of the covenant entered into between God and his people, beginning with Abraham, and continuing forever. A real difficulty here presents itself to this view of the subject, and that is, that the seal of the covenant, the seal of the righteousness of faith (baptism) will be applied to multitudes who never had, and never will have, that righteousness; so that the seal of the God of truth will be affixed to a lie. To avoid this difficulty, some attach value to the water, and others to the water with the word, as a laver of regeneration washing away original sin, and placing the subject of it in a new relationship to God, or implanting the germ of spiritual life into the new-born soul, which, if cherished and nurtured, will develop itself unto eternal life. But the difficulty is not obviated. The subjects of baptism, under all these views, and every other, of the rite, continue in large numbers, and die in sin. We might however ask, by way of meeting the objection, whether the evil can be prevented by pursuing any other course, and whether it is not an evil which belongs to the very nature of the visible church. We so regard it, and do not find the evil not only not obviated, but not abated by the adoption of any other course. The same difficulty exists in adult baptism. Our baptist friends will not deny that they have as many defective, and vicious, and ungodly members in their church, as are to be found among the infant baptisers. The same difficulty occurs among those who commune at the table of the Lord. But surely the objection loses much of its force, if the

statement already made be sustained by the facts in the case, viz : that the true worshippers of God, as far as man can judge, are ordinarily, in God's providence, gathered from among the children of believing parents. The same difficulty occurred under the Old Testament dispensation, with the express command of God that the seal of the covenant should be placed upon the infant seed when eight days old. What shall we say then to these things? If God himself required his people to seal their children when eight days old, and annexed the fearful penalty, that the uncircumcised man-child should be cut off from his people, because he had broken his covenant, shall we be wiser than God, and exclude from the benefits of the covenant, those whom God has included? Shall we send the children away, as did the apostles of old, though our blessed Master calls to them, and says, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Besides, if a correct estimate could be made of innocence of character, and preparedness for a better world, and a comparison be instituted between adult and infant members of the church, with which of the two classes would we choose to cast our lot? The Savior has answered the question, in the estimate he put upon children. The difficulty, which occasions the objection, grows out of an erroneous notion concerning the nature of the church of God, by confounding those who make a profession of piety, and those who really possess it; and by confounding a visible with the invisible union with Christ, the covenant with the church bestowing upon it rich spiritual blessings, and the covenant of grace in Christ based upon his omniscience and the foreseen faith of the sincere christian.

But it may be objected, yet farther, to these views, that if they be correct, then should children also be admitted to the table of the Lord, and be subject to all the discipline of adult church members. The reply is, most certainly should children be entitled to this privilege, as soon as they understand its nature, and, by an open avowal of their purpose, formally consecrate themselves to the service of the Lord. Children, in the church, occupy the same relative position as in the family and in political society. The reins of government are not put into the hands of children, neither in the family should children occupy the chief places, or be put under the heaviest responsibility; whilst in both they are protected, and are admitted to all the blessings which they are capable of improving and enjoying. This is manifestly the correct theory of the visible church, and that which was sanctioned by God himself

under the Mosaic dispensation. The same remarks are true, as applied to the discipline of the young. A felt responsibility to the church, as the society constituted by God for their highest spiritual welfare, would exert a powerful influence upon the young, in restraining them from excesses, and in preserving them within the limits of law and order. As the church is now constituted *actually*, in many of its parts, the young do not conceive that they are members of the church until they make what is called a profession of religion. They regard themselves, as their parents and many others do, in the world, without restraint, and under no obligations but those which they choose voluntarily to assume. As though God, and Christ, and the Holy Ghost, and the church had no claim upon them, and they were under no obligations to submit to them and obey them. To the formation of these erroneous notions, the church herself has contributed largely. As well might the child declare itself independent of its parents, and of the government from which it has derived its security and freedom from oppression and injury. Who can conjecture the influence for good which the prayers and discipline, as well as the doctrine and ordinances of the church would exert upon a wayward son, over whom parental authority had been exercised in vain? If pastors, church officers, and church members, realized the value of the children of the church, and cherished for them the affection, and exercised over them the supervision which the nature of the church and the word of God demand, we would not see so many precious souls, the purchase of the Redeemer's blood, lost to holiness and heaven. The encroachments of the world upon the church are witnessed in nothing more strikingly than in the selfishness which characterizes the officers and members of the church. Every one looks upon his own things, and not upon those of his brother. Business not only interferes with social meetings, but with all the spiritual interests of the church. So that the church, in many congregations, may be regarded as a society formed for the convenience of its members, and not a christian society, formed for the glory of God, and for mutual spiritual advantage.

If these views of the relationship of the children of the church to the church be correct, then it will follow that they have claims upon the church, and rights in it. They have a right to the solemn acknowledgment of their membership, by baptism, and thus they have sealed to them all the blessings of the covenant, viz: Christ and the blessings of his salvation. They are entitled to the prayers of the membership of the

church, individually and collectively. Is any one so sceptical as to regard this as a trifling privilege? Then let him cure his scepticism by reading what Christ and his apostles have written on the subject of prayer. They are entitled to the instruction, and protection, and control of the church. The time-honored use of the catechism, for a time laid aside by some, under the pressure of false views of revivals of religion, should be resumed. The theory of our church meets this just claim of the young most admirably. Much to be regretted is it, that any of our congregations should have intermitted this salutary custom. They should be early and thoroughly indoctrinated into the doctrines of the church, not only a few, but all, inasmuch as all are necessary to furnish the man of God thoroughly. They have a right to be protected from the evil influences of a wicked world, to be warned and guarded against the various forms of vice by which they are surrounded and will be assailed. If led astray, if betrayed into transgression, or neglect of duty, the church is bound, by the most solemn obligations, to control and restrain them. The congregation which discharges its obligations to the children of the church under her care, cannot fail to flourish. Whilst the congregation which does not feel and recognize the claims of her children upon her, must be not only misguided in sentiment, but wanting in heart.

On the other hand, there are solemn duties resting upon the children of the church, the neglect of which will surely bring upon them the wrath of the great head of the church. They are bound to revere her authority and promote her happiness. Have they not been fostered by her care, sustained by her prayers, and indoctrinated by her into the truth? How then, can they, without great guilt, be indifferent to her welfare? Does she not seek their highest good? Does she not remonstrate with them in their errors, and exhort and entreat them to flee from the wrath to come, and lay hold on eternal life? In a word, does she not put forth efforts such as no civil society has ever put forth, on their behalf, and yet how disgraceful and wicked would it be to disregard the laws of the land, and be indifferent to their country's welfare. A young man who would manifest such a spirit, would meet with the contempt of the virtuous, and have stamped upon him the mark of reprobation. How much more deserving of this condemnation, when indifferent to the church of the living God.

It is the duty of the young, at a proper age, to profess the name of Christ, to commune at his table, and to walk in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless.

The course which is very common among the young is, to go out into the world, after they have spent a few years in the Sabbath school, to speak lightly of the church, her ordinances and her members, and to feel themselves free from all religious restraints, until they may choose to receive them. They seem to think that a profession of allegiance to Christ is optional, and that the omission of it contracts no guilt. But this is a great mistake. Can they get to heaven without confessing and serving their Savior? If they do not choose to confess Christ, is it not because they choose to live in sin? He himself has uttered the fearful sentence that if they will not confess him before men, he will not confess them before his Father who is in heaven.

The claims of the children of the church upon the church, are especially binding in the case of orphans, whose destitute condition awakens the sympathy even of those who sustain no relationship to the church, how much more should the covenant people of God remember them, since he has declared concerning them, that he is their avenger. It is because the church, as such, has neglected her duty to the suffering and destitute, whom she was bound by the most intimate relationship to relieve, that voluntary associations have sprung up and have taken the work of love and mercy out of her hands.

Finally, the question will be asked, what shall we do with the children of parents who are out of the church, and yet desire earnestly that their children may be connected with the church by the rite of baptism. We say unhesitatingly, let the parents themselves, who by the supposition, are anxious for the salvation of their offspring, unite with the church, and thus, by their own faith and obedience, bring their children into covenant relationship with God. Then the rite will be not only a sign, but a seal of the blessings promised, not to those who neglect the church, and her founder and head, but to those who reverence, honor and obey them.

These remarks, for which the writer claims no merit on the score of originality, either as to matter or arrangement, are recorded for the benefit of those who may be perplexed on the subject under discussion. If he has succeeded in throwing light on a difficult subject, and relieving the embarrassment of the anxious inquirer after truth, he will be amply repaid for the time and labor invested in this production.

ARTICLE III.

REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

EZRA KELLER, D. D.

*Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit :
Nulli flebilior, quam mihi.*

It is nearly twenty-two years, since we became acquainted with the subject of the present sketch. We met him for the first time in the fall of 1833, and we remember most distinctly the impression he made upon our mind. We felt that we were in the presence of a good man, who was under the influence of christian principle, and who realized the deep responsibilities of life. His countenance indicated some degree of sternness, yet there seemed beneath much tenderness of feeling, and great kindness of heart. The tone of his conversation was elevated, his manner sedate and dignified, his intercourse affable and pleasant. Subsequent communication and more intimate relations produced no change in the opinion we then formed of his character. Our estimate of his great moral worth was rather strengthened, as our acquaintance increased. The more we saw of him, the more were we impressed with the purity and devotion of his christian principle. Mr. Keller was, at the time, a member of the Junior class in Pennsylvania College, holding a high rank in the institution, and exerting an influence, which it is seldom the privilege of a student to exert. He commanded the respect of all, and possessed the warm esteem of those, who were admitted to more familiar intercourse. He was earnestly conscientious, and most faithful to his convictions; appearing never to lose his sense of the Divine presence, and continually seeking and relying upon the Divine direction and support. His very appearance was a check to levity or thoughtlessness; his sobriety forbade all hilarity and foolish jesting. He never connived at what was wrong. No one, when he was present, advocated a measure of questionable morality, or indulged in that which was sinful, without receiving a stern rebuke. His christian character was such as to inspire universal confidence; it was not marred by the glaring inconsistencies, often so common in those who call themselves christians. His religion he carried with him into all places, and on no occasion did he make any compromise with principle. He was always ready for "every

good word and work," and actively engaged in usefulness as he had opportunity. In the Sabbath School, at the social meeting for prayer, in the visitation of the sick, his labors were most assiduous. He was punctual in the performance of every obligation which was incumbent upon him, and most prompt in fulfilling all his engagements. We never knew him to be absent from a college exercise, or delinquent in the observance of any regulation required by the authorities of the institution. The same traits of character he afterwards exhibited, when he entered upon the public duties of life. In every position, in which he was placed, he stood forth as a model of christian activity and consistency. He was much beloved while he lived, and when he died there was great lamentation made over him.

In endeavoring to recall to our mind the various features in Dr. Keller's character, his unaffected, devoted piety, seems to have been the most prominent. It exerted a controlling power, and influenced all his movements. It was constantly operative, giving direction to his whole life. No one was more diligent than he in the acquisition of religious knowledge and the culture of the devout affections. All who came in contact with him were struck with his spirituality. "He was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." He was a man of prayer; he loved to pray, and had great faith in prayer. His confidence in God's promises never wavered. His mind was contemplative. He was constitutionally thoughtful. He loved with Isaac to meditate at evening, and to commune with his own heart. He understood the workings of the human heart. He had himself met with many difficulties in the divine life, and had passed through severe conflicts in his religious experience. His temperament was warm, his passions were strong, but he had obtained a mastery over himself. He loved the church, devoted himself to her elevation, labored for her extension, wept over her desolations, prayed for her prosperity, and devised liberal things for her advancement. He was deeply interested in the furtherance of evangelical truth and piety, and in every effort designed to spread the knowledge of God. He was attached to the cause of missions, the Sunday School enterprise, the Colonization scheme, and all those great and noble institutions of the day, which are accomplishing so much, in the providence of God, for the diffusion of christianity. The cause of beneficiary education was dear to his heart, and enlisted his earnest efforts and fervent prayers. He was not unmindful of the important aid which he had received from this source, in the prosecution of his studies, and fre-

quently expressed his gratitude to the church. He sympathized deeply with the poor and pious youth, struggling with poverty, and enduring other trials in the course of their preparation for the sacred office, and was always ready to afford them counsel and assistance. He possessed great benevolence of heart. It was his practice to set apart, regularly, a portion of his pecuniary means for religious objects. He gave from principle, and in his benefactions was unostentatious. He was willing to make sacrifices for the cause, to which he had consecrated himself, and which he felt in duty bound to promote. He was the warm friend of revivals of religion, and during such seasons labored with great acceptance and success.

Moral courage was a striking trait in Dr. Keller's character. He was adequate to any emergency, requiring its exercise. He never shrunk from the performance of any work to which duty called him. He was bold and fearless in the advocacy of such measures as he thought were right, regardless of the praise or the censure of his fellow men. He never inquired, whether this course of action would please or offend, is this measure popular or impolitic, but the simple question with him was, is it authorized by the word of God, can I invoke upon it the benediction of heaven? He was willing to incur the displeasure of the world, provided his conduct secured the approbation of his own heart, and the approval of his God. Nothing could tempt him to swerve from principle, or to forsake the path of rectitude. He was a man of stern integrity, and unflinching adherence to the truth.

Dr. Keller possessed great force of character, which gave him more than ordinary influence over those, with whom he was associated. He was also remarkable for his untiring energy and indomitable perseverance. His was an iron will and a resolute purpose. In youth he had formed habits of self-reliance, which he carried with him through life. When an enterprise was undertaken by him, it was sure to succeed. Difficulties were speedily overcome, the greatest obstacles surmounted. His interest in the work never flagged, his patience never tired, his zeal was unwearied. No matter how uninviting the field, or how gloomy the prospect, or how arduous the toil, or irksome the duty, he never despaired. His life was emphatically a life of severe and constant labor.

Pater ipse colendi

Haud facilem esse viam voluit.

He met with formidable discouragements, and encountered violent opposition in his efforts to prepare for the gospel minis-

try, yet he did not despond. He was firm in his purpose, and decided in his course. In all his difficulties and trials he exhibited the most wonderful fortitude. He was hopeful. He knew that light would arise out of darkness, that "weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning."

As a preacher, Dr. Keller possessed considerable ability. From the beginning of his career, he cherished the hallowed desire to excel as a minister of Christ. To this object his constant and steady efforts were directed. He never failed to fix and hold the attention of his audience. He was plain and lucid, solid and biblical, appropriate and practical. In his exhibitions of truth, he adapted his language to the humblest capacity. His illustrations were simple and pertinent, his allusions tender and touching. He usually made a copious use of scriptural language, and frequent reference to scriptural narrative. He never searched for hidden mysteries. He did not introduce into his sermons metaphysical subtleties, abstract generalizations, or philosophical speculations. The great doctrines and duties of the gospel were stated and urged in all their importance; and erroneous doctrines and sinful practices received their deserved condemnation. The salvation of the soul was, all the time, kept prominently in view, and what was uttered showed a heart glowing with the genuine fervor of evangelical piety. His manner was solemn and impressive, earnest and affectionate; the tones of his voice were clear, full and commanding, his enunciation easy and distinct, his gestures natural; his personal appearance, the contour of his face and the expression of his countenance, produced a deep impression upon the mind of the hearer, and increased the effect. There was an evangelical unction pervading all his discourse. He spoke as he felt, without any studied affectation. Every word he uttered seemed to come from his inmost soul. It was not his practice to write out his sermons at length, but, after having prepared a skeleton, to get a train of thought fixed in his mind, and then trust to the moment for the language. He was never at a loss for words. His diction was remarkably full and expressive. In public prayer he was most felicitous in his language, and always devout in his manner. There was none of the hurry or the irreverence, which so often characterizes the devotional exercises of the sanctuary. No one, who heard him, could resist the conviction, that the spirit which he breathed was imbibed in the closet, and that the petitions ascended from a heart, in which the Sanctifier and Comforter had his constant dwelling place.

Dr. Keller's services, during a series of religious meetings, were generally in demand. His labors, on such occasions, were owned of God and made instrumental in the conversion. We heard him several times in the Spring of 1843, during a season of religious interest, and the impression he produced will not soon be forgotten. We heard him from the words: "O Lord, revive thy work, in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known; in wrath remember mercy;" and again, from the text: "O do not this abominable thing that I hate," and also from the passage, "Ye are of your father, the devil." We likewise listened to him, when he presented the reasonableness of religion, and the duty of surrendering the heart to the Lord, as well as when he discoursed on the love of God, as evinced in the gift of his Son, and our recollection of the occasion, the preacher and the services, is as vivid as the occurrences of yesterday. The earnest expostulation of this man of God, his tender and thrilling appeal, the deep concern he manifested in the sinner's welfare, excited an interest, such as we have rarely witnessed, and crowded the place of worship with attentive hearers. The effect of this memorable period was overwhelming, the influence most extensive and salutary.

"The infidel believed;
Light-thoughted mirth grew serious and wept;
The laugh profane sunk in a sigh of deep
Repentance; the blasphemer kneeling, prayed,
And prostrate in the dust for mercy called."

The wild and the reckless were subdued by the truth; the idle, the dissipated, the profane, the scoffer and the despiser of religion were among the first to yield their hearts to the gracious influences of the Spirit. We saw those, who were hitherto unconcerned, and living regardless of their highest interests, arrested in their course, and turn to the Lord with full purpose of heart. Frivolous amusements and trifling conversation were laid aside; the voice of prayer and praise was heard; conscience became more tender, duty was discharged with increased fidelity—every bosom seemed to swell with emotions of gratitude, every heart was vocal with praise. It was indeed a precious visitation. There was no noise, no undue excitement. During the whole of the interest, the most perfect order, and the greatest solemnity pervaded all the public exercises, such as are wont to accompany those deep emotions, which spring from the agitated soul. The work was deep and permanent. And when the time came for those who had been the subjects of a change, to make a public profession of

their faith, it was a most interesting spectacle to see them surround the altar and enter into an everlasting covenant with their Heavenly Parent. Of the large number, who at that time expressed their attachment to the Savior, many have since been called to stand as a watch upon Zion's tower. They are now zealously engaged in their Master's vineyard, ornaments to the church, and the guides of others to glory. To this season of spiritual refreshing they trace their christian experience, the spirit that animates their toils, and the sweet hope that brightens life. In the faithful memory of the past, they have found a much needed guide, a priceless peace. A letter is now lying on our table, recently written by one, who was then brought to a consideration of his eternal interests, and who is now successfully laboring in the Episcopal ministry. He says: "It is now twelve years since I was arrested by the Spirit of God in my course of depravity and vice, and made to feel the quickening power of the Divine Spirit, to see the mercy of God, and to own and love my Savior. The eventful scenes of that memorable Spring never, in time or eternity, can fade from my remembrance. I try every year, on my knees in fervent prayer, to recall them and fix them in my mind, and to reproduce all the associations and events that make up that sacred season." Others were associated with the subject of our narrative in his labors of love on this solemn occasion, whose ministrations were owned and blessed, yet, as they are still among us, no reference is made to any part they performed in the services.

Dr. Keller was a very successful pastor. He was indefatigable in this department of his responsible vocation.

"With all of patience and affection taught,
Rebuked, persuaded, solaced, counselled, warned,
In fervent style and manner."

He kept a faithful watch over his flock. He was instant in season and out of season. He imitated the example of his Master, who went about doing good. He was fitted for a seat in the sick chamber, and in the house of mourning; he was welcomed as a visiter to the fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and as a guide to the doubting and the erring. His words were "fily spoken," they were "like apples of gold in pictures of silver." Although regarded by some as stern, he possessed warm sympathies and great tenderness of heart. He swayed equally with the law of kindness and the law of firmness. He usually obtained a strong influence over those, with whom he was brought into contact. Whithersoever he went, he awakened a lively interest, and was fondly remembered.

Dr. Keller was a man of good natural abilities. His mind acted with great directness, clearness and force, readily grasping the strong points of every subject, which engaged his attention. He never sought to enlighten others on what he did not comprehend himself. He possessed strong common sense, an accurate judgment, and a penetrating foresight. Had it been the will of God to spare him, he would have developed as a man, and as a minister of the gospel, and occupied a foremost rank in his profession. His studies were confined almost entirely to one department. His life was too active, and his pastoral labors too numerous, to afford him leisure for literary or scientific research. Nothing from his pen was ever published, except a discourse, delivered before the Alumni of the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, in the autumn of 1844. The Doctorate of Divinity he received from Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., at its annual Commencement in 1845.

The subject of our sketch was the son of Jacob and Rosanna Keller, and was born in Middletown Valley, Frederick County, Md., June 12th, 1812. Of his early life we know very little. At the age of twelve he was sent to the school of a pious German teacher, whose religious influence was very salutary, and to whom Mr. Keller, in after life, often referred with the most affectionate recollection. This good man was deeply interested in the spiritual welfare of his pupils. He instructed them in the catechism, and endeavored to impress upon their minds the duty of seeking God's blessing in daily prayer. The impressions thus received were not lost upon young Keller. Although after he left school, for a season, they seemed to have passed away, yet they were subsequently revived under the influence of his pious grandfather, who often conversed with him respecting the interests of his soul. The reading of the Holy Scriptures, and attendance upon the house of God, deepened his impressions and awakened thoughtful attention. His mind was more or less exercised upon the subject of religion, for the space of three years, but it was not brought to a decision, until he had reached his fifteenth year. About this time his father had in his employ a lame laborer, a most exemplary christian, who took a lively interest in Ezra, and frequently urged upon his consideration the great question of eternity. In the winter of 1828 he was induced to accompany the man to a religious meeting, to hear an aged minister preach. The subject of the discourse was the "Christian life, and its blessed reward;" the truth powerfully arrested the attention of the youthful hearer, and produced the most pungent convictions. These, at first, he attempted to resist. His

unrenewed heart seemed unwilling to submit to the influences of the Holy Spirit. Whilst he was in this state of mind, one Sabbath morning his mother gave him a volume of sermons to read. Taking it with him, he retired to his father's barn, and there, after serious meditation and earnest prayer, he resolved, with the Divine aid, to surrender his heart, fully and unreservedly to the Lord. The prayer of faith was heard, "the peace of God which passeth all understanding," was experienced; the young disciple rejoiced in his Savior, and in the hope of everlasting life. He soon after made a public profession of religion, and united with the church, of which Rev. A. Reck was then pastor, well known as an acceptable and useful minister in the Lutheran church. Having now cordially embraced the Savior as his only hope and portion, he was led to inquire with Paul, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" Desirous of testifying his love to the Redeemer, and of doing good to his fellow men, he believed that it was his duty to serve Christ in the gospel ministry. So strongly was he impressed with the conviction, that he regarded it as a call from God, and determined to obey it. When he disclosed his conviction to his father, he received from him no sympathy or encouragement for the prosecution of his design. The requisite pecuniary aid for obtaining an education was withheld by the parent, in consequence of the improper ideas he entertained of the work of the ministry. This did not, however, turn aside the son from the object he had in view. Influenced by an unquenchable desire to preach the gospel, he was not to be deterred from his purpose; he resolved to make any sacrifices or put forth any effort, that was necessary in qualifying him for usefulness in the church. He consulted his pastor, who encouraged him in the work, and for several months gave him private instruction, preparatory to his departure from home. In the autumn of 1830, when he bade adieu to the scenes of his childhood, and directed his face towards College, he travelled without funds, to Gettysburg, the whole distance, on foot. The education society here proffered its friendly aid. For its benefactions he ever seemed most grateful, and in after years, when the privations of his youth had passed away, and he received his patrimony, he cheerfully refunded all that he had received. During his collegiate course he had to contend with adverse circumstances, yet with the blessing of heaven resting upon him, his perseverance and habits of economy, enabled him to attain the object of his wishes. At the age of eighteen he was willing to sit down to an academic curriculum of several years, and fit himself for the responsibilities of the ministerial office.

These responsibilities he deeply felt, and whilst he most ardently desired to be a preacher of the gospel, he was too conscientious to rush into its duties without the mental discipline and acquisition, which would justify him in going forth as a teacher of others. Whilst a student he never lost sight of the great object after which his heart panted, and in the preparation for which he was diligently engaged. He passed through the dangers and trials incident to college life, without sustaining any injury. Although the position is regarded by some as a trying one, and unfavorable to the cultivation of high-toned piety, he lost none of his spirituality. In the fall of 1835 he finished his college course, and received the first degree in the arts. The exercise assigned him by the Faculty, on the occasion of *Commencement*, was a dissertation on *Conscience*. His theological studies, which he had begun during his senior year in college, he continued industriously to pursue, and entered the Seminary at Gettysburg, at the commencement of the winter term. On the completion of his studies, he devoted himself to the arduous work of an itinerant missionary for the Western states, under the auspices of the synod of Pennsylvania. In this tour to the West his labors were very much blessed. He gathered together many scattered sheep of the household of faith, who for a long time had been without a shepherd, and were destitute of the means of grace. The service in which he was engaged was also of great advantage to himself. It proved to him one of the best schools, and furnished him with valuable experience. It aided him in attaining those excellences which he possessed. He preached in the humblest and most destitute places, and learned to accommodate his language and manners to minds, that needed the simplest kind of instruction.

During the summer of 1837, he settled down as pastor of the Taneytown and Emmitsburg charge. It was a large field of labor, but he was enabled to make full proof of his ministry; his services were such as to secure the blessing of God in frequent refreshings. The congregations increased in numbers and in spirituality. His labors were held in high estimation, not only by his own people, but by the whole community. Whilst here he suffered from a bronchial affection, and the apprehension was entertained, that he would be compelled to suspend his official duties, but in the providence of God he was restored to health, and permitted to resume his labors. He very reluctantly, and with some pecuniary sacrifice, in the autumn of 1840, relinquished this charge, and accepted a call to Hagerstown, Md., impelled by a sense of duty, and a desire to

promote the general welfare of the church. Here his ministry was equally efficient. His labors were crowned with signal and abundant success, and he enjoyed, in an eminent degree, the attachment of his members. The pastoral tie was, however, soon again broken. A literary and theological school had been called into existence, for the wants of our western Zion, and Dr. Keller was regarded by the brethren as peculiarly fitted to take charge of the infant institution. Although he would much rather have remained pastor of the congregation, to which he was ministering with satisfaction and success, yet in obedience to the call of the church, and in compliance with the urgent wishes of the directors, he removed to the West in the spring of 1844. The expectations, that had been formed in reference to the qualifications of Dr. Keller for the post, were not disappointed. Wittenberg college was founded under his fostering care, and suddenly rose to an unexampled degree of prosperity. He displayed an energy and a zeal requisite for such an undertaking, the influence of which was infused into the friends of the rising institution. He possessed the confidence of the community among whom he resided, to an unwonted extent, and was gaining very much upon the sympathies and affections of our western brethren. At the time of his death, few men in the church gave greater promise of efficient, extensive and permanent influence. He was called away in the prime of life and in the midst of his usefulness. His death was a serious loss to the institution over which he presided, and a calamity to the church at large. That he, whose qualifications seemed so well adapted to subserve the interests of religion, and build up the church of Christ, was so soon cut down, in our urgent wants, from an important sphere of usefulness, which he had begun to occupy, is a mystery, for the solution of which we must wait, until we arrive at that place, where we shall not know in part, but as we are known. The ways of providence are frequently dark and mysterious! They baffle our wisdom, and conflict with all human calculations. When the prospects of an individual are often the brightest, and he is, humanly speaking, the most needed, he is removed by the hand of death, whilst so many cumberers of the ground are left in the way of others. "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter."

The work of our brother was finished, his destiny fulfilled! He had faithfully served his Master on the earth, he was called, perhaps, to perform higher services in the church triumphant, than can be rendered by man in this militant state. He died of Typhoid fever, December 29th, 1848. He was conscious

of his approaching dissolution, and requested some one to read to him the twenty-third Psalm. He feared not as he went down into the valley; he found no darkness, he met no terrors there. He, in whom he had believed, was by his side, and his soul was stayed upon him. On the evening before his death he told his family he was going home, he would fall asleep in Jesus. He had hoped to live, but he was prepared to die. Life had attractions, but death no sting. His wish was to live and labor for Christ, but he was ready to depart and be with Christ, which was far better. He could say with the apostle, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day." His end was in perfect harmony with his life, and a beautiful illustration of the power of christian principle. He did fall asleep in Jesus, and went up to swell the number of those "who came out of great tribulations, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

"Servant of God! well done,
Rest from thy lov'd employ,
The battle fought, the vict'ry won,
Enter thy Master's joy!"

The funeral solemnities were conducted by Rev. Messrs. D. P. Rosenmiller and S. Ritz, the latter delivering a discourse from the words: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." The tears shed on that day were an appropriate testimony to his exalted worth. Christians of every communion mourned, and the Baptist church appointed a meeting of humiliation and prayer, as an improvement of the occasion. His remains were buried in the College Cemetery, a beautiful spot on the grounds, a short distance from the College edifice. His grave could not have been made, where it would have been more frequently, reverently, and gratefully visited. Although comparatively brief were the years of his pilgrimage, and less than twelve in the ministry, his name is written too deeply upon our hearts to be effaced. He has left behind him a character too precious to be forgotten. "The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance."

WALTER GUNN.

"Some there are, whose names will live,
Not in the memories, but the hearts of men,
Because those hearts they comforted and raised,
And where they saw God's images cast down,
Lifted them up again, and blew the dust
From the worn features and disfigured limbs."

There is a more than ordinary interest associated with the memory of Walter Gunn, from the fact that he was the first missionary from the American Lutheran church, who fell in the foreign field. He was a man of faith and love, a missionary in its best and highest sense, of whom the world was not worthy. His career was brief, but he rendered important service in the cause, to which he had dedicated his life. He exerted an influence in India, which still lives, and in our own land he awakened an interest in foreign missions deep and permanent. His example may serve to stimulate others to engage with zeal and earnestness in the great work, to which he was devoted, and arouse the church to continued and increasing efforts in a cause, upon which the blessing of heaven has so signally rested.

The subject of our sketch was born at Carlisle, Schoharie County, N. Y., June 27th, 1815, and was, at the time of his death, in the thirty-seventh year of his age. It was in the year 1837, at a religious meeting held in his native place, that his attention became interested in spiritual subjects. His mind was arrested by the truth, and he professed a hope in Christ. Soon after, he united with the Lutheran church at Schoharie, of which the Rev. Dr. Lintner was, at the time, pastor. From this period his thoughts were particularly directed to the heathen. His mind was deeply impressed with the idea that he was called, in the providence of God, to declare the glad tidings of redemption to those, who were perishing in distant lands. He retired to some secluded spot, and there, alone, in the presence of his Heavenly Father, consecrated himself to the work of foreign missions; he resolved, if the Lord would open the way, he would preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to the benighted heathen. When his pastor was made acquainted with his determination, he was surprised that a young man, just awakened from a sinful life, should be exercised, immediately upon his conversion, so intensely in reference to the salvation of the heathen, particularly as at that time, there was scarcely any interest manifested in the subject by the church, with which he had connected himself. The Lutheran church had not yet established a foreign mission.

She had done comparatively little for the cause; her sympathy and her interest were directed to the destitution at home, her contributions were expended upon the waste places in our own widely extended land. The increase of immigration rendered it necessary to make constant provision for the wants of our brethren from Europe, who very naturally looked to the older congregations for aid in their new settlements. Mr. Gunn's decision upon this question excited the general attention of ministers and people to foreign missions within the bounds of the Hartwick synod, and produced the conviction that it was the duty of the church to engage in the work. It was regarded as a clear indication of providence, that the time had come for our denomination to extend its efforts to a foreign field, and to take part in the work for the evangelization of the world. The sentiment began to prevail, that God would have us to embark in the cause of foreign missions.

Mr. Gunn was, however, in indigent circumstances. He was without the necessary means to secure an education, requisite for the work in which he longed to engage. Although the prospect was gloomy, his confidence in God was strong. He felt that a way would be provided, and whatever difficulties might be encountered, all would ultimately be removed. At the annual convention of the Hartwick synod, held at Cobleskill, N. Y., in the year 1837, some five or six ladies, the wives of clergymen there present, united in the plan of educating a young man for the christian ministry, for the missionary work in heathen lands. They had met without any preconcerted arrangement, and while their husbands were engaged in synodical deliberations, they spent a season in prayer. Bowed in deep humility, and bathed in tears at the mercy seat, they committed their cause to God, resolving in his strength to commence the enterprise immediately. The Great Head of the church seemed to approve of their noble doings. Their efforts were crowned with success. Mr. Gunn offered himself as a candidate for the sacred office, and for the foreign field, and during his whole course of study, was sustained by the association, which had undertaken to educate him.

From this period Mr. Gunn commenced his studies with the ministry of reconciliation in view. After passing through a preparatory course in the academy at Schoharie, he entered Union college, at which he was graduated as Bachelor of Arts in 1840. His theological studies he pursued at the Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pa. During the entire course of his academic and theological training, he was distinguished for his diligence in study, and his attention to duty. He was ex-

tremely conscientious, and appeared constantly to realize his responsibility to God. He was ever anxious to be useful. He did not feel satisfied with himself, unless he had reason to believe that he was exerting an influence for good. He desired to live for some purpose, to diffuse human happiness, and to extend the kingdom of Christ.

*Ille potens sui
Lethusque deget, cui licet in diem
Dirisse, "Vixi."*

His uniform kindness and consistent deportment won all hearts and made him a general favorite. The fact too of his having dedicated his life to foreign missions, which idea appeared prominent in all his actions, awakened the sympathies of his fellow students, and filled them with missionary zeal. His influence was salutary. A decided impulse was given to the cause, and those, who could not feel that it was their duty to go, became interested in the work, and exerted themselves to uphold the cause.

In the fall of 1842, Mr. Gunn was licensed as a candidate for the ministry, by the Hartwick synod. After his licensure, for a brief period he labored by appointment of Synod, as a missionary in the domestic field, with instructions to preach on foreign missions in the different churches he visited. How much his mind was taken up with the work, to which he had given himself, may be inferred from the following extract from his journal, written at this time: "From the indications manifested in our churches, it must be very evident to the discerning, that it is high time to engage actively in the foreign missionary enterprise. It is true, there are some who are ever ready to utter the hackneyed expression, 'we have heathen enough at home, we have no men to spare, &c., &c.' but there are many others, who have taken a view of the wretchedness and misery of the guilty and degraded heathen, and their hearts have been touched with compassion: they have read the last command of Christ to his disciples, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,' and they feel that a portion of the great work of disseminating the gospel belongs to them. They look at the blessedness of their own condition, living as they do, within the sound of the church going bell, in the midst of the ministers of reconciliation, possessed of the hopes and joy which the religion of Jesus Christ inspires, and they cannot, they will not, remain indifferent, while the calls to help from the heathen world are so loud and impressive. They will not make the wants of the church at

home an excuse for withholding their aid in spreading the gospel in heathen lands."

In the spring of 1843, at the time of the meeting of the General Synod, in Baltimore, he received his appointment as missionary to India from our foreign missionary society. During the summer he was married to Miss Lorena Pultz, of Columbia Co., N. Y., a woman well qualified for the work of missions, to which she had devoted herself in early life, and whose labors among the heathen were so greatly blessed.¹ Mr. Gunn, prior to his departure for India, was directed by the society to spend some time in visiting the churches, and in preaching on missions, for the purpose of diffusing a missionary spirit, and collecting funds in aid of the society. This service he faithfully and satisfactorily performed.

The following autumn he was ordained as a missionary to the heathen in the Lutheran church, at Johnstown, by the Hartwick synod. The exercises on the occasion were particularly impressive. The ordination sermon was preached by Rev. J. Z. Senderling, from the words: "Drop down ye heavens from above, and let the skies pour down righteousness; let the earth open, and let them bring forth salvation, and let righteousness spring up together: I the Lord have created it." Mr. Gunn parted with the brethren amid scenes of thrilling interest and the deepest solemnity. Said the chairman of the committee: "Brother Gunn, we love you, but we love Christ more. We are anxious to have you go, that you may the sooner get to your work. We will not let you perish; we will hold you up, and we pledge you, that sooner than let you fall, one hundred dollars shall be annually given of our own salary if our ability remains what it is at present." A member of the synod writes, "who, that was there, can forget that night, that missionary, that noble cause, and best and most of all, that Savior?"

In the month of October, 1843, he received his instructions from the Executive Committee of our foreign missionary society, convened for the purpose in St. Matthew's church, Philadelphia. The corresponding secretary, Rev. Dr. Morris, read the instructions of the committee, and Rev. Dr. Kurtz delivered the charge. The missionary made a reply. In the course of his remarks he said: "If it is our duty to go to heathen lands, it is yours to uphold us there. You give your money—we give *more*—we give our *lives*!" In the following month

¹ Mrs. Gunn survives her husband, and is, at present, in this country, superintending the education of her two children.

Mr. Gunn, with his wife, sailed for India. In a communication to his pastor, on the eve of his departure, he says: I have preached my last sermon in my native land. We feel cheerful in view of the prospect before us, and trust that the Lord will sustain us in that hour, when we shall bid adieu to the last of our friends. The promises of God are exceedingly precious to us, and we find near approaches to the Savior in prayer." Our missionaries arrived at Guntoor the ensuing spring, June 18th, 1844, just seven months after they had left their native shores, and immediately entered upon the duties of their mission, in connection with Rev. C. F. Heyer, who had been previously commissioned by the Pennsylvania synod, and had selected this point in India, as most favorable to our operations.¹ The sequel has shown the wisdom of the choice. No location could have presented stronger inducements for missionary labor, or offered greater advantages for the prosecution of the work. Mr. Gunn was cordially received by Dr. Heyer, who had been actively engaged in the field for two years. They now labored harmoniously together, and by their united energies and faithful coöperation, the work was successfully carried on, and the mission strengthened. In a letter written to Rev. Dr. Lintner, soon after his arrival in India, he says: "Here I am now in Guntoor, with my beloved wife, engaged in our labors among the heathen. Our principal work is the study of the Telugu language. At family worship each day, we have eight or ten persons in attendance, some of whom can understand English, and to these I have the privilege of unfolding the gospel of Christ. Mrs. Gunn has a small class, whom she is teaching the elements of the English language. One is a man of forty years old, two are females, who appear to be interested in the truth. A few nights since, after we had retired, we heard a low voice in an adjoining apartment: it was the voice of prayer from one of these females. O, my dear brother, you cannot imagine how cheering these tokens of the Divine favor are to our souls in this land of darkness." In a subsequent communication he writes: "Our schools are now in quite a flourishing condition, and I trust much good will result from them. The care of the boys is divided between me and Mr. Heyer. The girls' school is under the superintendence of Mrs. Gunn, and numbers thirty-two. Considering the opposition of the natives to the education of females; this is quite encouraging." It is true, they

¹ *Vide* History of our foreign missionary operations in the Evangelical Review, Vol. V. p. 104.

were called to pass through various trials, they had to contend with inveterate prejudice, and meet with bitter opposition to the truth, but they did not despair. They were sustained by the promises of the gospel, they trusted in God. Mr. Gunn describes the condition of things in the following language: "The indifference of the ungrateful people, among whom we are wearing out the energies of our bodies and souls, often makes our hearts bleed. We remember, however, that it was for just such that Jesus came to suffer, and that it is only the grace of God which makes us to differ from them. In the midst of our cares and delights, we often find delight in looking forward to our eternal home. The rest, that remaineth for the people of God, is just before us. A few more months and years, our trials will be over, and the glories of heaven burst on our vision; and then, if we should be so happy as to meet around the throne of God some heathen, saved through our instrumentality, our joy will be full."

Mr. Gunn's attention, during his early residence in India, was chiefly directed to the acquisition of the language. While thus employed, he preached to the English residents, and also to the natives, through an interpreter. This was to him very satisfactory, as it furnished him with an opportunity for doing good. But he burned with an ardent desire to be more useful, and exceedingly longed for the time when he could address the natives in their own language. He writes to his former pastor: "How I long to speak to the heathen in their own language. I can now express myself with considerable ease, on common topics, in short sentences, in the Telugu language: but have to resort to an interpreter, when I wish to make myself understood in a public and continuous discourse. I am thankful to my Heavenly Father that I am now able, to a certain extent, to make known the great truths of the gospel to those who are willing to hear, and I trust, with the Divine assistance, I shall be permitted, in a few months, to preach more effectually to the heathen in their own tongue."

Mr. Gunn continued to labor in faith and with perseverance, and he had the satisfaction of seeing the work of the Lord prosper through his instrumentality. The work steadily advanced. The seed sown was blessed, and yielded a precious harvest. Souls were hopefully rescued from eternal ruin, and introduced into the fold of Christ. His hands were encouraged, and his heart rejoiced. In a private communication to a friend in this country, he writes: "There is an old grey-headed Telugu here, who is a servant of Christ, and oftens prays the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers into the field. An-

other native christian and his wife, walked ten or twelve miles yesterday, over a bad road, with a child in their arms, to attend the service on the Sabbath, and walked home again in the afternoon. Another young man I baptized yesterday, who seems to be truly taught of the Holy Spirit. Others are coming regularly to me from villages ten or fifteen miles distant, to be instructed in the principles of christianity. O, dear brother, is it not a privilege to do something for the heathen? Could you have seen the joy that beamed from the countenance of the young convert I baptized yesterday, and heard the expressions of christian feeling he uttered, you might have formed some idea of the blessedness of laboring among the heathen, notwithstanding the trials and difficulties, with which we have to contend." In his report to the Executive Committee for the year 1847, our missionary states: "The number of scholars in connexion with our four schools at Guntoor, is one hundred. I have preached twice on the Sabbath regularly to our native congregation throughout the year, with one or two exceptions. The number in attendance has been from fifty to one hundred and fifty. I have had many opportunities of addressing persons coming from a distance, upon the great doctrines and truths of christianity, and placing in their hands tracts and parts of scripture on their return to their homes. Thus the seed of the word has been sown. How much of it will hereafter spring up and bear fruit, is known only to God, in whom we trust." The efforts of this man of God were not in vain. The mission was strengthened, and gained upon the affections of our people. Churches were established and schools gathered; the word steadily progressed amid the many obstacles it was compelled to encounter, and souls hopefully converted to God. The seven years' labors of our departed missionary were productive of the most glorious results, both among the benighted 'Telugus and among the churches at home. The prayers and toils, the counsels and the example of this faithful servant, are connected with events in the church of God, which the future alone can unfold.

Mr. Gunn's health now began to decline. By repeated attacks of fever, his constitution became impaired, so as to unfit him to resist the organic disease, with which he had long been threatened. He was visited with hemorrhage of the lungs, and his strength gradually failed. His physicians advised a cessation from labor, and a journey to the sea-shore. In the spring of 1850, he accordingly repaired to Madras, and sojourned for a season in the family of Dr. Scudder. Here he seemed to gain a temporary relief, and the hope was entertained that

he might speedily resume his duties. On his return, however, he found that he was not able to perform much active labor. Yet his heart was still in the work, and he was anxious to accomplish all that he could. When he was no longer able to preach, he labored to do good to the souls of those who visited him at his house, and embraced every suitable opportunity of engaging in religious conversation with the heathen. The converts often assembled in his chamber, and poured out their hearts in prayer to God for their shepherd and the mission; and those seasons of prayer with those, whom God had given him as seals to his ministry, he regarded as the happiest seasons he spent on earth. In the last letter he wrote, when near his end, he says: "How many mercies and trials have I experienced since I stood up in the church of Schoharie, and declared my determination to preach the gospel to the heathen. Three or four times I have been within a step of death, but I am still alive, and deem it a blessed privilege to exert my strength in this blessed cause. I was thinking a few days since what a privilege it was, in the midst of bodily weakness and languor, to listen to the fervent prayers and praises of the converts, whom the Lord has given in Guntor from the Telugus. What will be our joy when we shall meet these converts in heaven? O! it is delightful to meet with these first fruits of our mission, round the throne of grace. They are the happiest seasons I have ever experienced." The extracts from his letters, we have given, illustrate his constant habit of mind, the daily current of his thoughts. The earthly pilgrimage of Mr. Gunn appeared to be rapidly approaching its termination. He himself was conscious that he was on the threshold of the eternal world. He was, however, in a most happy frame of mind, and patiently waited for his change. He frequently spoke of the work which he was about to leave, and trusted that God would raise up laborers to succeed him. His interest in the salvation of the heathen, as he drew near his end, seemed to increase, and he urged all, who had been associated with him in the mission, to consecrate themselves more fully to the work. On one occasion, when he was suffering from great physical debility, he remarked to a friend, that he felt the frail tabernacle rapidly giving way, but he rejoiced that when it did fall, he had "a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." He referred to the evils, with which he had to contend in his own breast, and mourned over his sins, but he reposed unlimited confidence in the merits and righteousness of his Savior, and was happy in the bright pros-

pect before him of everlasting perfection and bliss. He regretted that he had accomplished so little in the cause for which he had been permitted to labor, but he hoped that the work would go on, and God be glorified in it. In a conversation one day, on the approaching change, his wife inquired how it appeared to him, and how he thought he should be able to meet it. He referred her to his favorite hymn,

Rock of ages, cleft for me!
Let me hide myself in thee;

and remarked that its sentiments described his feelings much better than he could express them. On the 27th of June Rev. Messrs. Heyer and Grœning, our missionaries from the neighboring stations, convened at his house. The day was devoted to religious conversation and devotional exercises. It was a solemn occasion. They had come to unite their prayers and sympathies with their departing brother, and to commend him, and the cause he loved, to the God of missions. The following Lord's day, the little band of missionaries commemorated the love of their dying Redeemer. It was the last communion season on earth Mr. Gunn enjoyed. He experienced from this sacred ordinance much comfort and peace. He was favored with rich manifestations of the divine presence. He continued to grow weaker, but his mind remained unimpaired. His faith was unwavering. On being asked if he had any fears of death, he replied, "None at all—all is bright and glorious!" "I have been," said he, "an unprofitable servant, but it is a comfort to know that we are accepted in Christ, the beloved." On the day preceding his death, he said to Judge Robde, who had called to see him, "I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him, against that day." On the day of his death, just before his departure, he folded his hands and distinctly prayed, "Lord Jesus come, come quickly, and take thine unworthy servant to glory." Although tenderly attached to his family, he gave them up without any reluctance. He knew that God would take care of them. "I can now," he said, "leave you to the protection of him who is a father to the fatherless and the widow's God." He called his children to his bed-side, and laid his hands upon the head of each, and with his dying admonition, gave them a father's blessing. After which he composed himself to meet the last enemy. There was no struggle! His countenance was serene, his mind calm and peaceful. The possession of his powers he retained till the last. When asked whether Jesus was with him, he faintly whispered, "Yes, Jesus is with me," and with these words

on his lips, his spirit took its flight to mansions in the skies, on Saturday evening, July 8th, 1851.

Some of the heathen were present at the mission house, to witness the last moments of him, whom in life they loved so well. After he was dead, four of the native converts begged that they might remain and watch with his body during the night. They wished to testify their affection for him, whose voice was now silent in death. During the stillness of the night, they were gathered around the corpse reading the New Testament, and engaged in singing the favorite stanzas of their beloved pastor in the Telugu language. The funeral exercises took place on Sabbath afternoon, and were conducted by Rev. C. F. Heyer, our missionary at Gurzal, in the English language, and Rev. C. W. Grœning, at Ellore, in Telugu. The native christians, and the children of the mission schools sang in Telugu, the hymn "Rock of ages, cleft for me." The services were attended by the District Judge, the Chief Magistrate and other English residents at the station, also by a large number of natives, both christian and heathen. The coffin was placed in a palakeen, and carried from the house to the grave-yard by twelve bearers; at the grave-yard gate it was taken up by twelve invalids, native sepoy's, and borne to the silent tomb. There he will sweetly slumber,

"Till the last trumpet's joyful sound;
Then burst the chains with sweet surprise,
And in his Savior's image rise."

Mr. Gunn was a man of good natural abilities and respectable attainments. Although his talents were not brilliant, his intellect was sound, and enriched by a liberal education. He had diligently improved his advantages. His views were evangelical, his conduct irreproachable, his piety humble, ardent, devoted and enlarged. His christian attainments were above the ordinary standard. He was distinguished for his humility; he was always ready to acknowledge his own deficiencies, and disposed to profit by the advice and counsel of those more experienced. He enjoyed communion with his God, and often repaired to the throne of grace. He never engaged in a work without imploring the divine direction. He knew that the blessing of heaven was essential to the success of any enterprise. The word of God he read with devout attention. He studied its holy precepts, cherished its heavenly hopes, and sought to exemplify in his conduct, and experience in his heart, its purifying, its saving influence. To its teachings he always yielded implicit obedience. No sacrifice, which it required, was regarded by him as too great. In the discharge

of his duties, he was truthful, upright, faithful, courageous and persevering. His preaching was instructive; it was eminently practical and earnest, and usually made a deep impression upon those who heard him. "Christ and him crucified," was the theme upon which he delighted to dwell, and with which his discourses abounded. He had an ardent love for souls, and a predominant desire for the salvation of the heathen. He was convinced that they were lost, and could only be saved by the gospel. He devoted himself to the work of foreign missions from a principle of attachment to his Divine Master, and a sincere regard for his glory. He looked upon the employment as a great and glorious employment. "Who can," said he, "estimate the dignity and glory of this enterprise?" In it he engaged with his whole soul, and labored for its advancement patiently and cheerfully as long as his strength continued. In his severest trials and most painful conflicts, he would not have exchanged it for any other employment on earth. Its interests were, in his opinion, identified with the glory of God and the highest welfare of the human race. The human soul he regarded of priceless value, and for its salvation he was willing to endure any labor, or practice any self-denial. He never grew weary in well doing.

Mr. Gunn was universally beloved. He had the power of securing the esteem of all who came under his influence. All who knew him felt, that a good man had fallen, and sincerely mourned his removal. No tribute to his memory, no expression of regard for his worth, was withheld. The subjoined extract from a letter written by Hon. Henry Stokes, a pious gentleman in the service of the British government, and a warm friend of the mission in India, shows how highly he was esteemed by the English residents: "Our grief for the loss of so dear and valuable a friend, and so useful a laborer, may well be tempered with thankfulness for the grace given to him, both in life and death. His light shone clear and steady, and many have reason to glorify God in him. How pleasing it is to recall the time he spent among us! His pure and tender spirit, his hearty love for his brethren, his meekness, his patient labor, his unrepining sufferings, in all he has left us a bright and valuable example. *The memory of the just is blessed.*"

His work is finished, his mission accomplished. He has gone up to join Schwartz, Ziegenbalg, Vanderkemp, and a host of other worthies who died in their master's service on India's shores. He rests from his labors, but his works do follow him. The last great day alone will reveal the multitudes who were, under God, conducted to the throne of the Lamb through

his instrumentality. Let us fervently pray that his spirit may fall upon those who are in a course of preparation for the ministry in the schools of the prophets, that others may rise up and take his place. Let us acknowledge the goodness of the Great Head of the church, in furnishing us with so lovely an example for our encouragement and our imitation! May his life furnish us with additional incentives to renewed exertion in our christian course, animate us to more vigorous effort and more earnest prayer, and a more entire consecration of soul in the work of disseminating the gospel and converting the world. Let us keep distinctly in view the parting command of our risen Savior: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," remembering the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world!"

ARTICLE IV.

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.

It was the opinion of De Quincey, that Coleridge, Wordsworth and Southey were three men upon whom posterity, in every age, would look back with interest as profound, perhaps, as belonged to any names of their era. The voice of the literary world has freely ratified the justness of that sentiment. Reviewed with unscrupulous severity, when their writings first brought them to the public view, by self-complacent and dogmatical critics, they passed unhurt through the process, and were but greater in the view of men, simply from having survived so severe an ordeal. Sometimes an Ediuburg or a London reviewer has presumption enough to imagine that all authors are at his mercy, and that he can annihilate forever, or hand to some enviable position of literary fame, whomever he may choose; but in the case of these three men, as in many others, their critics have lived long enough to see their labor lost, and their decision reversed at the higher tribunal of the thinking mind, and the appreciating heart of the learned public. We say "the learned public," for the illiterate portion have nothing to do with these things; being either wholly unacquainted with them, or incapable of appreciating their merits. The literary public, after due consideration, has embalmed these names for perpetual preservation among the great

dead; or rather, they have decreed that though these men have died, they shall still "live forever."

In reference to Samuel T. Coleridge, indeed, whose character and writings are now to engage our attention, we see this most complimentary fact, that every year, as he becomes more fully comprehended and appreciated, he is raised to a more elevated seat among the great ones of our race. Although Coleridge has thus become popular, it is a popularity almost entirely among the learned. He belongs to them; he can never be a popular author among the masses. The common mind must be greatly elevated, before it will either read, appreciate or love his writings. Though every body *ought* to know something about Coleridge, yet few of the great men of mind are less known to the mass of society than he; a fact resulting simply from the same reason, that a peasant will sometimes remain unacquainted with the top of the mountain, around which he sees the clouds play, at the foot of which he lives all his life-time: it is so high and difficult to climb. It is sometimes represented as an almost necessary characteristic of the truly great mind, that it will make difficult things plain, and dark things light to the uneducated and ignorant. But this is only measurably true. It holds with regard to all subjects capable of being made simple. But some *subjects* are too profound and comprehensive, and intricate and lofty, to be simplified by any amount of intellectual light and power, and brought within the view of the untutored. They are up on the mountain; they cannot be carried down, and if you wish to see them, you must go up.

To estimate aright the character of Coleridge and his productions, demands that we should view him in relation to the educational processes that developed and gave bent to his mind, and the course of his personal life, amid which his intellectual labors were performed. We must see every part of character and every portion of his life, to form an adequate conception of the aggregate man. The painter would not get a more uncertain portrait of a man, if he painted only from a view of half the face, than we should have of a person's literary merits, by leaving out of sight the most active agencies in determining and modifying his literary ability. Circumstances sometimes give coloring to all life and its results. We see these in the case of Coleridge.

As the son of a Vicar, or Pastor, he was, of course, born to an inheritance of worldly poverty. His birthday was 21st of October, 1772. His father was Rev. John Coleridge, who had charge of Ottery St. Mary, in Devonshire. His mother, with

a singularly unmotherly heart, which mothers sometimes manifest, treated the little fellow with a harshness that almost amounted to persecution. At the age of nine years he was left an orphan. The fact of his being poor now began to give direction to his life. It was the reason of his being placed at Christ Church Hospital School, London. Even for this, he was indebted to the kindness of a friend. Here, as a school-fellow, he first made the acquaintance of the inimitable Charles Lamb, an acquaintance distant and formal during these school days, but which afterwards ripened into a deep and permanent friendship. From his rapid progress in studies, he was soon discovered to possess rare ability. He was fortunate in having a teacher disposed to encourage talent, even though he did it according to the severe discipline which many a boy then learned by sad experience, to be prevalent in Grammar schools. Coleridge afterwards speaks of the rigor of his training here; but whether or not his active and energetic mind needed and received the developing influences of the unmerciful flagellations that frightened knowledge into duller brains, he has not told us. He tells us, however, of the rigid manner in which he was compelled to perform his mental work. He had to analyze the orations and poetry of ancient times, as well as the greatest works of English classic literature, and separate all the spurious ornament from their real merits. But already, under these circumstances, and at the premature age of fifteen, he had bewildered himself in the speculations of metaphysical and theological controversy. Nothing else, he says, pleased him. History and facts lost all their interest. Even poetry, novels and romances, which are apt to fascinate the young imagination, became insipid to him. It is scarcely possible to say *why* this was so, or what had been the productive cause of this unusual mode of his intellectual employment. It is best, perhaps, to regard this as an instinctive announcement of his deeper nature, an intimation of what was in him, and would afterwards blossom and bear golden fruitage.

From this peculiar state, his mind was fortunately diverted by an incident that wielded a wonderful influence over his subsequent literary habits and feelings. This was the presentation, from a school-fellow, of Mr. Bowles' Sonnets, which had just been published. By these he was enthusiastically delighted and inspired. Wishing to present them to his friends, and being too poor to buy copies, he transcribed these sonnets no less than forty times. They became his companions and his love. Subsequently referring to the influence they had

over him, he says: "Well were it for me, perhaps, had I never relapsed into the same mental disease, if I had continued to pluck the flower and reap the harvest from the cultivated surface, instead of delving into the unwholesome quicksilver mines of metaphysical depths."

From Christ's hospital, by the privilege of his station at school, he was transferred to Jesus College, Cambridge, at the age of eighteen. In this place he signalized himself by taking a prize for a Greek ode, and by being a noisy youth, and rather heedless of the dictates of sobriety. His faults, however, were not very original, but extraordinary only as being the faults of an extraordinary person. His stay here was short; for in the second year, in a fit of despondency from disappointed love, it is said, a calamity to which it seems the philosopher, as well as the simpleton, is sometimes the victim, he left; went to London and enlisted in the fifteenth dragoons, under the fictitious name of Cumberback. To keep fashion with all raw recruits, he was accommodating enough very naturally to fall from his horse, as often as was courteous to do so, when first put under the direction of the riding master. But his scholarship soon betrayed him, as not being what he seemed, and his friends procured his discharge.

He then went to Bristol, where Southey was living, and soon afterwards began his literary career. The political paper, "The Watchman," which he attempted to conduct, proved a failure, from various causes, the principal of which seems to have been, that Coleridge was not adapted to be a political leader, his style and manner of thought being of a character unsuited to please the masses of the people.

An illustration of the uncertainty of youthful dreamings is connected with the events of Coleridge's life about this time. When he left the University, his mind was full of the idea of the political regeneration of the world. Robert Lovell and Southey were warm supporters of the magnificent conception, and they had the whole system cut out and dried, that was to restore the world to Eden-like freedom and happiness. But they soon discovered that the world was too old and stubborn, to be regenerated, and governed according to their desired mode. But the poetic philosophers were not yet wholly baffled. Leaving the old, unpliant and incorrigible world to take care of itself, or go to ruin, just as it might prefer, they planned the organization of a new political earth, a realized Platonic republic, which was to be founded in America, on the Susquehanna or Mississippi (for authorities differ as to the precise location), where perfect liberty and pure philosophy would

drive away all the evils of corrupt society. This new republic was to bear the learned name of PANTISOCRACY. They dreamed the chimerical, but pleasant, and perhaps innocent dream of human perfectability. But a change soon came over the spirit of their dream. For in the midst of these gorgeous imaginings and magnificent plans, the three young philosophers fell in love with three sisters, in Bristol, and love, the strange thing, scattered forever the brilliant illusion. The three philosophers *married* the three sisters, and in the perpetuation of the corrupt race of the old world, they forgot, or declined, ever to actualize their plan of a new. Whether America has lost much by this misfortune, we leave for political philosophers to decide. We do not know.

After his marriage he removed to Nether Stowey, a village among the Quantock hills in Somersetshire. Here he enjoyed very frequent intercourse with Wordsworth, who was residing at All-Foxen, only two miles distant. The attrition and communion of two such minds, could not fail to be mutually advantageous. During the three years he lived here, he composed a considerable number of his poems. As a means of subsistence, he contributed verses to one of the London newspapers. At this place already, according to an authority before quoted, began the manifestation of a condition of things, that threw a long shadow, though a light one, over his happiness. He made the discovery, not unfrequently made by persons in such circumstances, that his marriage was not as happy a one as he supposed it would be. No open alienation, indeed, ever took place, but there was simply a want of the living congeniality and responsive sympathy that alone can bind two lives in one. But that is enough; for this negative happiness is true misery, and the domestic fire need only be cheerless to be gloomy. If, as is represented,

"The tying of two in wedlock is as
The tuning of two lutes in one key,"

we have enough to account for their failure to realize all the enjoyment the relation ought properly to yield, in understanding that their minds had not been attuned at the same elevated note. Mrs. Coleridge was far from being what would be called an inferior or unworthy woman; yet she was incompetent to comprehend cordially and adequately, her husband's intellectual powers, or to sympathize with his peculiar and almost eccentric literary tendencies. Failing to distinguish between popular talent, which succeeds fast and gathers a quick harvest of transient applause or substantial wealth, and that higher

talent, of divine character and slower progress in public esteem, whose harvest ripens for ages, she seemed disappointed and chafed in not seeing at least an ordinary measure of worldly consequence secured by the exercise of his powers. His own carelessness and want of persevering application, gave a coloring of justice to her dissatisfaction. In excuse of her, it may be said, that it is probable that circumstances such as theirs would almost surely lay a ground of discontent and fretfulness in any woman's mind, not unusually kind and magnanimous. Notwithstanding this drawback, the time spent at Stowey seems to have been the most successful of his literary life. His fame forever was *won* here, but he *received* most of it afterwards. At this time he held Unitarian sentiments, and was accustomed to officiate as preacher, in the Unitarian chapel at Taunton and Shrewsbury. Afterwards he wholly rejected his Unitarianism, and lived and labored for the Anglican church, in whose communion he died.

In 1798, by the generous patronage of Josiah and Thomas Wedgewood, he was enabled to visit Germany, with the design of completing his education. At the University of Göttingen, he attended the lectures of the far-famed Blumenbach, and it exhibits a fine trait of Coleridge's disposition, that he always afterwards referred to him, as indeed he did to all his teachers, in terms of grateful and almost filial regard. He returned home, with a good reading acquaintance with the German language and literature. Then, having tasted of the mystical stream of Teutonic philosophy, all his earlier predilections for metaphysical speculation returned upon him, and he delved and roamed, apparently ever delighted, amid the labyrinthian systems of Kant and Schelling, and kindred minds. That he did not estimate the poets of Germany as highly as he did its philosophers, we may gather from a remark made by him in reference to Klopstock, whom he knew personally, and whose fame was then in the ascendant. In answer to one asserting that Klopstock was the German Milton, he said, "True, sir, a *very* German Milton."

Coleridge now took up his residence by the lakes that lie, like silver patches, among the heaths and hills of Westmoreland and Cumberland. In this way the three poets got together again. Wordsworth was at Grasmere, and Southey and Coleridge lived at Greta Hall, near Keswick, occupying that large house on some plan of friendly division and accommodation. This contiguity of residence of these three, at the lakes, a contiguity that arose, in fact, rather from attractions of personal friendship and relationships, than from any precon-

certed literary design, or even sameness of literary principles; gave origin to the well-known term, "The lake School of Poets," applied to them by reviewers. From this time his literary life moved steadily on, interwoven with incidents of great interest, but which cannot here be related. Awhile in the island of Malta; awhile, again, in Germany, always in poverty, to carry out the English fashion of rewarding her literary men, he contrived by contributing to the "London Morning Post," and afterwards to the "Courier," to raise his income of "filthy lucre" to a living rate; till at length his condition was made easy by domestication in the house of Mr. Gillman, of Highgate, London. Here he remained until his death, which occurred in 1834. His literary labors were extended through a period of thirty-six years—from 1794 to 1830.

We have thus only outlined the history of his life, to help us understand his character and writings. We see the processes by which his character was made and developed, and have a glimpse of the circumstances amid which he wrote. The first rays of the morning sun only meet the hill-tops; yet by reflection, the deep valleys also become lighted. So the prominent points of his history being seen, in their reflected light we can better analyze the whole intellectual and literary man.

Viewing Coleridge simply as a man, made up of head and heart, developed in personal character, there are many things to constitute him unique, and, perhaps, wonderful.

Intellectually he was far from being an ordinary man. A high authority, and one by no means partial, decides that he possessed "the largest and most spacious intellect, the subtlest and most comprehensive, that has yet existed among men." His mind was of that peculiar cast, that, in its restlessness, roams, like a spectral spirit, through desert and wilderness-places of thought, lighting his twisted and dangerous pathway by the brilliancy of his own mental glances. The course of his thought MAY have been luminous to *himself*, but it was scarcely, or only occasionally so to others. Like the distant river which you view from an eminence, winding through the valleys, and disappearing behind hills, now flashing in the sunlight, now lost in the gloom of the forests, or the shadows of rocks and ridges, the course of his mind moved on, gleaming beautifully sometimes, but then dark or eclipse-like, until far onward it would flash out again to your gaze. Carlyle very complacently, and somewhat unjustly, we think, speaks of his mental operations as "pervenient moonshine." To say the least of it, there is quite as much *sunlight* in Coleridge's

mind as in Carlyle's. It is singularly inappropriate, in a man like Carlyle, whose speculative writings are so notoriously dreamy and incomprehensible to popular readers, and even to some well disciplined intellects, and whose depths and heights, if once discovered to them, *might* be found to reveal a great indefinable nothing, to charge the mind of Coleridge, or any other man, with want of natural clearness and logical coherence. The truth of the matter—lying in neither extreme—seems to be, that Coleridge's mind, though it was not wholly original in its processes, and lacked compactness of strength, had such rare and brilliant intuitions of truth, and such discriminating analytic power, as seldom falls to the lot of men. Its workings were instinctively speculative. Its intuitions were far-stretching and magnificent. And, moreover, this intellectual vigor and illumination, having combined with it the still deeper and loftier energies, and

"The vision and faculty divine"

of poetic power, constituted him one qualified, by natural gifts, at least, for some wonderful achievements.

This intellect was disciplined and developed by an elaborate and discursive process of reading and study. Philosophy, ancient and modern, literature, of wide range, had passed under the absorbing action of his mind. He gathered the spoils of all times and systems. A tenacious memory and ready command of his acquisitions, made him capable of holding his friends in wrapped astonishment at the immense profusion of his intellectual wealth. It is no labor for the sun to shine—nor was it for him. His writings give evidence of this amplitude and variety of his accumulations; but they were most manifest in his social conversations. The ability to converse well is not common. Sometimes the greatest men are most deficient here, but in Coleridge there was the rare genius, for it is something higher than simple talent, to make the loftiest subjects and thoughts familiar enough for the social conversation, and to introduce them there without any unpleasant appearance of pedantry. When the subject was once started, he had the talk nearly all to himself, the company seeming both unable and unwilling to interrupt his fascinating monologue, and it became what we may best designate, as conversational oratory. There was such a munificent prodigality of profound conceptions, beautiful illustrations, tresses of golden thought, gems brought from every place and time; all affording such pure radiances of wavy light to the soul, and such enchanting glimpses into the higher heavens of truth, that the listeners

followed on gladly, knowing scarcely whither they went. And the music of his rich, sweet voice, like the worshipping choir, uttering these sentiments, turned them into an anthem of delight, into which the hearts of all had mingled and were singing. "Did you ever hear me preach?" asked Coleridge once of Lamb. "I never heard you do anything else," was Lamb's reply. Dr. Dobbin mentions that on the occasion of his first acquaintance with him, at a dinner party, he spoke in this way "for two hours, with unhesitating and uninterrupted fluency," and says that as he returned homeward, he thought a second Johnson had visited the earth to make wise the sons of men, and regretted that he could not exercise the powers of a second Boswell to record the wisdom and the eloquence that fell from the orator's lips.

Coleridge was aware of his power in conversation, and, perhaps, had he been less gifted and less vain of this gift, he would have done more of a permanent character, for his honor. His natural disposition made him content, for the time, with these evanescent displays of his mental riches, and thus, possibly, he was beguiled out of some mightier and enduring monument, which he ought to have built for himself. Perhaps Milton's blindness gave the world a "Paradise Lost," and Coleridge's conversational brilliancy may be the reason why he left undone some sublime thing in literature, which it is generally believed, God had given him the power to do.

But this singular vanity in this rare, yet comparatively trifling ability, if it did not *itself*, and alone, lead him to neglect some more worthy work, yet doubtless coincided with the more immediate cause of the partial inefficiency of his literary life. This more immediate cause was his miserable *opium eating*. This stupified his intellectual activities, and rendered him indisposed and incompetent to the high and prolonged exertion necessary to achieve the great result that the world expected from his genius. The habit victimized him, and fettered him with Titanic strength. Even his lectures before the Royal Society were a failure from this cause, Coleridge either being absent from the house crowded with the brilliant audiences, having come to hear, by reason of this factitious indisposition, or from the same reason producing little that was worthy of himself or his previous fame. It exhibits an amusing, instructive, and yet common fact in human nature, however, that De Quincey, the most voracious opium eater that ever drew English breath, has been most stern in his reprobation of this habit in Coleridge. In this, however, he only illustrates a fact often noticeable, that the most experienced in vice, will, by the reacting

forces of his higher and purer nature, offer some compensation to society and virtue for the evil he has done. It is due to Coleridge to remember that, he vanquished this opium eating habit some time before his death.

There was, somewhere or other, in his mind, a flaw that neutralized his power. His writings and conversations are just enough to show us what he could have done. He, indeed, felt that he had undisplayed power, struggling in his nature, for deliverance, but he also felt himself too irresolute and fitful, ever to actualize the possibilities that were in him. It is true, he did write a great deal, but it was mostly of a local and temporary character, which would necessarily lose its interest after the circumstances that called it forth had passed away. Such were the multitudinous essays, essays almost unrivalled, indeed, in their intrinsic excellence, published in the *Morning Post* and the *Courier*. To these he afterwards, in his *Biographia Literaria*, referred, as a vindication from the charge of indolence, and to show that he had not lived a fruitless life. He spoke with pleasure of the fact that some of his political papers were republished by the journals of this country, and even quoted in some Massachusetts state-papers. He thought that he ought to be judged by what he *had* effected, and that what he *could* have done, ought to be left a question for his own conscience. Still, he confesses that there is more justice in the charge than was pleasant to his own remembrance. He lamented his deficiency in self-control, and his neglect to concentrate his powers on some more permanent work.

Considering his personal character, we must not, however, exclude from it many of the highest and purest excellences. Whatever querulousness he sometimes showed, he still had a deep, warm, and true heart. He was the sure friend of whatever he believed to be virtuous and good. The tone of his moral sentiments was lofty. His heart was full of genuine sympathies. To feel this, one need only read his letters to Charles Lamb. And whatever we may think of some of his speculations in philosophy and religion, during a part of his life, it must be conceded that he was always a sincere lover and seeker of the truth. Though his inquiring spirit seemed to drift, for a while, from the pure faith of his childhood, and to be driven anchorless among the cold, high, polar regions of mystic speculation, yet, in circumnavigating the realms of thought, he arrived at the home from which he appeared to have gone: and in him we see beautifully illustrated, the idea of Bacon, that "a little philosophy takes away, but depth of philosophy brings the mind back to religion."

As we would naturally infer from this glance at the man, the *literary character* of Coleridge, as seen in his works, is like some vast, unfinished palace; all gigantic, beautiful, but incomplete. Here is a column, entire, beautiful beyond description, looking as though it had uprisen by the force of some wild magic, or been sculptured by angels' hand, which had left some of their spiritual, bewildering light dancing around it. Here is another column, equally glorious, but broken off midway up. Here are some just begun, there some places marked out, and all around are pure blocks of marble, fresh from the quarry. Being largely of the German mind, which can do more thinking than any other, but leaves to others of more utilitarian tendencies to do the acting, Coleridge *thought* as scarcely any other man could; dug up golden materials from the deep mines of intellect, but he had no hand, or was indisposed to use it, if he had, to work them up into the gorgeous temple which a more practical power would have erected.

Still, notwithstanding the broken character of his labors, he has here and there imprinted enough of his own mighty image on his literary structures to make it pleasant to look and admire.

His *prose writings*, which have, at the same time, been most censured and most praised, have perhaps gained him his greatest prominence in the scholastic world. They are mostly of a metaphysical and theological nature. His theology and philosophy ran into each other, and interpenetrated. He can hardly be said to have written on either, separately from the other, but on both in their mutual relations and harmonies. He seemed to feel that true philosophy and true religion, though distinct as a matter of investigation, were really a unit in the great, all-comprehensive system of truth; parts, in name, as items, but inseparably united in any just conception of universal verity. He believed that the world of truth, theological and philosophical, was filled with harmonies, like the spheres with music. He labored to trace them. These two subjects are joined together in his writings, and we will look at his theology only, as we see it in a scrutiny into his metaphysics.

The opinions of Coleridge in intellectual science have often been misunderstood, and the value of his investigations very differently estimated. Some have deemed him an unrivalled philosopher, others, as merely the retailer of fragmentary and mystical German theorizing. The truth of the matter seems to be, that, though few of his views are purely original with himself, he had a deep philosophical vision, and saw truths

hidden to the common eye of philosophy. And his position in English metaphysics, must in justice, be regarded as that of the introducer and defender of some of the discursive speculations of Germany. This he did with honorable ability, and with so much force that his writings mark the epoch of a great change in the direction of English mental science.

At the time when he turned his thoughts to intellectual philosophy, the system of Locke had almost undisturbed sway in England. It was a great system, unquestionably an advance, in the direction of truth, on Aristotle, whom it displaced, but it was far from being perfect. It was constructed, indeed, largely on the inductive principle of Bacon, but it stopped short of being a complete analysis of the mental powers. In some respects it was even *positively* faulty. It did not meet all the felt wants of the consciousness and relationships of men. Several features were often unpleasantly felt to involve troublesome and absurd conclusions.

One feature of this character was, *that ALL knowledge is derived through the medium of the physical senses.* It was the sensational system. The entire cognitive faculty, or rather power, was named the "understanding," and this was a *passive receptive capacity*, with no active ability to originate thought, and having no other power in reference to the ideas impressed on it by sensation, but to pass judgment on them, and arrange them in different relations and combinations. The system denied the possibility of the knowledge of things, except as determined by the ideas of them received through the senses. It represented that the cognitive power could not originate simple ideas, or change them, but that it must passively receive them as they are presented to it. The mind was regarded as a "*tabula vasa*," on which were simply written the perceptions introduced by the senses from the external world.

Several consequences were legitimately involved in this theory. *First*, That man could have no knowledge of anything but material objects. For, he would, necessarily, have no ideas but of the external and tangible. The world, in his mind, would have only the images of the world without, and the mind could not know anything above sense or material objects. It could know no truth above material truth; no thought of anything higher than material, accidental, circumstantial and perishable; nothing of the absolute; nothing of the eternal; nothing of the immaterial or spiritual; nothing, perhaps, of God. Such a system, with such materialistic affinities, did not satisfy the felt wants of the deeper consciousness of the

soul. A *second* consequence involved was, that it made the movement of the mind little more than a mechanical necessity. Ideas, being all from objects without, *must* be received when their objects are presented. In this the mind was to act passively and necessarily. Sensational impulses would move and control the mental processes; and man, being subject thus to material laws, would be just what his circumstances would make him. Human liberty would be sunk into the supremacy of sensational forces. The will would move according to the law of mechanical dynamics, and would be but the resultant of the different materialistic impressions and impulses from the external world. Accepting this system as true, it would be scarcely possible to avoid the conclusion, that the soul's freedom would be merely mechanical; a freedom irresistibly necessitated, and therefore, equivalent to none at all.

With this system Coleridge was dissatisfied. He saw what were its legitimate, yet incorrect conclusions. To him, it was axiomatic, that in a universe where all is harmony, truth must ever be consistent with itself; and, therefore, he felt there must be some error in this materialistic system of psychology. His acquaintance with the German philosophy gave him the hint, and he pursued it, to correct the error.

The essential, starting point, on which his whole theory hangs, is a distinction between the understanding and the reason. The mind is a unit, but these are two of its powers. They had been confounded or identified in the system of Locke. Coleridge defined the understanding as the "faculty of judging according to sense." This definition he adopted from Kant. The understanding, then, embraces all the knowledge derived through sensations from the external world. Thus far it agrees with Locke. But the reason, and here is the difference, ascends higher, and is defined as "the power of universal and necessary convictions, the source and substance of truths above sense, and having their evidence in themselves." Its vision stretches beyond the domain of the sensuous understanding. It is the faculty which gathers knowledge at once, by *intuition*, and it needs no other proof of the reality of what it knows than its own convicting consciousness of it. Here the deficiencies and difficulties of the sensational philosophy are met. *First*, the impossibility is removed, of the mind having thoughts and ideas of other things than material and accidental; of the absolute, the immortal and spiritual. And *secondly*, the mechanical necessity of the mind is broken by the introduction into its constitution, of the purely rational

life; the super-sensuous reason, uncontrolled by the fortuitous, material objects without. Here we see the element of free agency, which christianity attributes to man. *Further*, we here see something, a spiritual personality, that transcends the material, and lives and acts without dependence on it, a something that can, and will, perform its functions without the co-operation or presence of the physical organism. Here is immortality.

Several other features of mental and moral life follow in beautiful connection. *First*, we see how *conscience* is something real, and in its decisions, absolute and not wholly contingent. It dwells in the reason, which intuitively pronounces its judgment on moral relations. *Again*, we have a basis for *human responsibility*. We necessarily link responsibility to the self-moving will and the power of free action. To predicate it where there is a forced necessity, is a philosophical absurdity. The sensuous understanding is not enough. The brute has sensations from external objects, and may collect experiences through its whole existence, but from the absence of the higher power of the reason, as the central life of the spiritual soul, it is incapable of progress, and, confessedly, morally unaccountable. The sense of guilt and remorse, also, attests this *free* rational power in man. *Further*, the psychological nature of sin is explained. Sin belongs to the volitionary power, that lies back of processes of the rational faculties, when it determines to disregard and violate the decisions of the reason. Should the *will* decide on action simply from sensational impulses, the action might be virtuous or vicious, just as the external influences on the senses might, or might not be agreeable to conscience. But the will being able to rise above all extraneous motives, and to listen to the voice of the super-sensuous reason, as expressed in the conscience, its determinations in opposition to that voice become criminal. And *further still*, we get a glimpse of the nature of original depravity. It is seen to be a *bias* in the active volitionary power to disregard and violate the decisions of this reason when it decides, as it almost infallibly does, in harmony with righteousness and God. Every system of philosophy, to be true, must take into account this moral obliquity of the mental action, not to prove it, but to explain it. It has other proof enough. For it ever remains, manifestly, and consciously, a self-demonstrating fact. And this, too, whether revealed religion be believed or rejected. And those who have obtuseness enough to deny it, and the book that teaches it, or the philosophy that accounts for it, are

mostly those who are themselves the best exemplifications and proofs of its existence.

But it is as a poet that Coleridge affords us the most pleasure. The poetic tendencies of the time were beginning to take a new direction, under the influence of the lake school. One characteristic feature in this new school was, the adoption of the subjects and language of common every-day life, as the materials and mode of poetry, in opposition to the far-fetched subjects and artificial and highly wrought style, supposed to be almost indispensable; and another, the appealing to the higher and purer sympathies and tendencies of humanity, for poetic effect, in opposition to the alliance which poetry had been made to sustain with the baser and more turbulent passions, as in Byron and writers of his stamp. It sought to elevate the thoughts, and feelings, and acts of ordinary experience into the sphere of the pleasurable: and, in the form, with the charm and purifying power of poetry, to send them back home to the recognizing and responding heart. It wished to redeem poetry from its unworthy part in serving at the shrine of the fierce impulses of unkind nature and sensuality, to make it a cultivator of the spiritual and divine in man, and a minister at the altar of religion. This design was noble and holy. Poetry *should* be as refined, and pure, and beautiful as angels' talk, and should *educate* the heart towards heaven. It is true, too, that it should deal so much with the common experiences of life, as to take the sympathies of the heart, and refine and elevate them. But the *mode* proposed, to take *common* subjects and *familiar, rustic* language, was found to be, in part, both impracticable and unphilosophical. For it is discovered that, when common subjects and words are taken, and wrought into *true poetry*, both the thought and the style cease at once, and necessarily, to be the thoughts and style they were before. They lose their identity, which is equivalent to annihilation.

It is common to hear Coleridge spoken of as belonging to this lake school. This is partly true, and partly not. Almost the only connection that either Southey or Coleridge had with that theory, resulted simply from contemporaneousness, and contiguity of location with its chief advocate, Wordsworth. He was the author, and both Coleridge and Southey took exception to many points in his system. At this time Southey was scarcely on friendly terms with Wordsworth. And it is indisputable that Coleridge was the first to show the errors of Wordsworth, and indicate how far his theory was not feasible. Yet both he and Southey saw a great deal of truth and good philosophy involved in it, and their own poetry shows that

they were more under its influence than they were ready to admit, or were even aware. Those three poets had much in common, unconsciously perhaps, but enough to show how instinctively alike the conclusions of the true poetic nature are. The Byronic poetry of passion was felt to be incompatible with the best development of the human heart-life. And a purer humanity sought to take the "good, the true and the beautiful" in life, and lift them and it up into the region of sanctified poetry, and to delight the imagination with that which would be worthy of its better nature and destiny. And their poetry is eminently "home poetry," household influence, to watch, like the old "household gods," over the sanctity of the family altar and family life. It is the poetry, too, of intellect, poetry first taken, however, into the heart, and *warm*ed there, before it is given to the world. It is not cold, *intellectually* cold. It does not forget that man has a heart. Wordsworth speaks of "two voices,"

—— "one of the sea,
One of the mountains; each a mighty voice."

But there is another, as deep and loud as they; the voice of the great human heart. Their poetry is its utterances. They have given voice to many things the heart had felt before, but could not speak. With Wordsworth at their head, they have blessed the world immensely, by giving it a home literature; a literature, communion with which will never taint, but always beautify the soul. The heart leaps up to them, as it does when it sees a "rainbow in the sky," and thanks them for the refreshment it has received. This is particularly true in reference to the poetry of Wordsworth.

We do not claim for Coleridge the *first* rank as a poet. Yet he is much above an ordinary one. The world produces few of such almost limitless and delicate imagination, and ability to mould language at his own will. He has given us some poems, which, of their kind, are unrivalled and inimitable. They are intimations of what procrastination and opium prevented him from doing. His sonnets and ballads are often sweet, rich and deep. They however embody too much subtle philosophy, ever to become popular. There is a depth of thought running through his poetry, that shows his peculiar mind. It is a vein of gold when you trace it. His dramas are indifferent, though abounding in beautiful descriptions. His lyric and ballad productions are his gems. His "Hymn before sunrise in the vale of Chamoning," is the sublimest thing in the lyric poetry of our language. It is the inspiration into itself of all the majesty and glory of that divinely

built Alp, and the worship of all the voices in Coleridge's great soul. Yet with all its dread sublimity, there is in the anthem a placid enchantment,

— "like some sweet, beguiling melody,
So sweet, we know not we are listening to it."

All the thoughts of it are high, and much nearer heaven than our common thoughts. It is a great Alp of poetry. But you could as easily have a just idea of those ineffable mountains of Switzerland without seeing them, as of this hymn without reading it.

"Christabel" is only a fragment, but it is a fragment of beauty. Coleridge tells us that, at the time, he had the rest all in his mind, and hoped to put it all on paper, but the world regrets that he never accomplished his purpose. M. F. Tupper evidently mistook his calling when he attempted to finish it. His comparatively plodding genius was no more adapted to fit anything on to Coleridge's fairy-like and rapid imagination, than a *will-o-the-wisp* would be, to be fastened to the stream of lightning-fire that glorifies the rugged storm cloud. The story is of the lady Christabel, who meets, in a grove, at night, a fiend disguised as a beautiful damsel, that tells a tale of sad distress, and is taken home by Christabel, to Sir Leoline's castle. What was to have been the conclusion of the tale, no one knows. Its wild mysterious character, the music of its sentences, the undefined terror of the Lady Christabel, and the occasional glances of the snake-eye in the beautiful fiend-damsel, all give the poem an air of awe, wonder, and bewildering fascination. Without introducing any part of the tale as such, we quote one passage on broken friendship, which once read, is seldom forgotten :

"Alas! they had been friends in youth;
But whispering tongues can poison truth,
And constancy lives in realms above.
And life is thorny; and youth is vain;
And to be wroth with one we love
Doth work like madness in the brain.
And thus it chanced, as I divine,
With Roland and Sir Leoline.
Each spake words of high disdain
And insult to his heart's best brother;
They parted—ne'er to meet again!
But never either found another
To free the hollow heart from paining—
They stood aloof, the scars remaining
Like cliffs that had been rent asunder;
A dreary sea now flows between."

"The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" is his most celebrated production. Like Christabel, it is constructed on the idea of

investing the supernatural with the forms of life. It is perfectly unique, unlike anything else in literature. It is a story that almost makes the heart stop beating, told to a wedding guest, whom the "bright-eyed mariner," as he relates it, holds spell-bound with his "glittering eye," as a maiden holds her lover. The weird power of the wild Rime over the wedding guest at last ceased—and

"He went like one that hath been stunned,
And is of sense forlorn,
A sadder and a wiser man
He rose the morrow morn."

Coleridge's works deserve a more thorough and general study among scholars, and we shall be gratified if this cursory view, given of his character, will awaken the wish and prompt the purpose in the reader, to investigate the subject further for himself.

ARTICLE V.

ON THE DIVISION OF THE DECALOGUE.

By Rev. Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., Easton, Pa.

AFTER the Israelites had reached the wilderness of Sinai, Moses informed them that it was the purpose of God to come down upon mount Sinai in the sight of all, and make a covenant with his people. On the third day the people met with God, and heard his voice which proceeded from the fire, the cloud and the thick darkness. They were deeply affected as they gazed on the awful scene before them, and listened to the solemn trumpet-notes which issued from the summit of the mount. The Lord wrote the words which he had pronounced, on two tables of stone, and delivered them to Moses. These "words" constituted the basis of the covenant which God made with Israel, and their eminent rank was demonstrated by the circumstance that they alone were graven by Jehovah upon the two tables of the testimony (Exod. 32: 15, 16). The familiar name by which they are known, is that of the "TEN COMMANDMENTS;" in the Old Testament they never receive this appellation, which is applied to other precepts of the Lord, but they are called, by way of eminence, the "*Ten Words*," that is, the DECALOGUE, in Exod 34: 28; Deut.

4: 13; 10: 4. In these passages the term "commandments" in the English version does not represent the original text with precision. It is possible that after the Babylonian Captivity, the Jews appropriated the name of "commandments" to them, by way of eminence, as we are ourselves accustomed to give a specific meaning to a general expression, when we designate the sacred volume by the term "Bible," that is, *Books* (Biblia), or "the Scriptures," that is, *the writings*. Still, the question which the young man addressed to Christ, (Matth. 19: 18) evidently in good faith, when the Lord spoke of "the commandments" (*tas entolas*), combined with the well known fact that the Jewish teachers could not agree respecting the commandments which were entitled to the highest rank (Matth. 22: 36), seems to imply that this practice did not yet exist, that the Decalogue had long ago receded from its proper and eminent position, and that it occupied merely a coordinate position among the ceremonial laws. It does not appear to have recovered the distinguished rank which belonged to it, until the Christian Era.

These "Ten words" occur twice in the Pentateuch, Exod. 20: 2-17, and Deut. 5: 6-21; in neither case are they numbered consecutively by Moses. It is remarkable that not a trace appears in the whole Old Testament of any attempt to designate by ordinal or cardinal numbers the respective places of the "Words" in the entire series, nor does Paul even remotely attempt it in Eph. 6: 2. The ancient Jews, Christ himself and the writers of the New Testament appear to have either attached no importance to the order in which they occur, or else to have regarded that order as established so firmly that no additional confirmation of it was needed. They even invert it without hesitation. The two passages in the Pentateuch, containing the original text, correspond to each other, but no writer after Moses adhered precisely to the arrangement which he furnished. In Hosea 4: 2, the prophet, who evidently refers to the Decalogue, places "stealing" before "committing adultery." In Matth. 5: 21 and 27, the Mosiac order is adopted, but in a succeeding verse (ver. 33) there is a clear allusion not only to Lev. 19: 12, but also to Exod 20: 7, indicating that Christ did not deliver the sermon on the mount with any reference to the succession of the ten commandments. In the three parallel passages, Matth. 19: 18, 19; Mark 10: 19; Luke 18: 20, while all relate the conversation between the Lord and the rich young man, Matthew differs from the other two, in the arrangement of the first two commandments quoted, (Mark and Luke place "adultery" before

"kill"), and the three concur in representing the Lord as placing: "Honor thy father, &c.," *after* the commandments referring to killing and stealing. Paul quotes the same in Rom. 13: 9, but he also places "adultery" before "kill;" the same transposition occurs in James 2: 11. These remarkable variations, and even the omission of several commandments, are easily explained, and can occasion no serious embarrassment. But the interpreter encounters very grave difficulties, when he attempts to specify precisely the words which constitute the first or the second commandment, or to indicate the sentences which form the ninth and tenth respectively. The expression: "*ten words*" in the passages mentioned above, imperatively require him to observe the number *ten* in any division which he may adopt, when he desires to prefix members to the several commandments constituting the series. The different modes of division which have been proposed may ultimately be reduced to two, which do not admit of being combined, and it is therefore unquestionable that at least one of them is erroneous. Moses could have counted *Ten* on the two tables in one way only, and the other is consequently a departure from historic truth.

The general question might, possibly, be dismissed as merely a theological, or rather an exegetical problem, since every mode of division presents *Ten* commandments, and admits of the introduction of the entire text, without additions or omissions. The Lutheran Church in the United States has, however, been compelled to view the question in a new aspect, and assign to it a higher practical importance than its members in other parts of the world have been accustomed to do. The division of the Decalogue which it has retained, differs from the one with which the various surrounding denominations are familiar; the general introduction of the English language into its public worship, and the wide circulation of the English Lutheran Catechism has made the difference perceptible to others. The latter frequently misunderstand the position of the church, and are unable to account for a circumstance which really assumes a grave character in their eyes. We were lately induced to re-examine the subject, in consequence of observing that the eminent Prof. J. H. Kurtz, (in the notes appended to § 47 of his "*Geschichte des alten Bundes*, Vol. II., which has at length been published) adopts an opinion in which he differs from the adherents of both of the usual divisions, and in which we cannot entirely concur with him. We propose to examine the general subject in this article, and avail ourselves of several facts which he introduces in the

course of his remarks. It will facilitate the examination of the subject, if we present to the reader's eye the text with its several divisions. The Lutheran division is designated by I, II, III, &c., and the mode generally adopted by other denominations, by (1), (2), (3), &c. Neither classification observes the modern division of the chapter into verses, which possesses no critical value, and which we also introduce simply for the sake of convenient reference.

EXODUS 20: 2—17.

VERSE 2. *I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.*

VER. 3. I. (1). *Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*

VER. 4. (2). *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:*

VER. 5. *Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me:*

VER. 6. *And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.*

VER. 7. II. (3). *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.*

VER. 8. III. (4). *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.*

VER. 9. *Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work:*

VER. 10. *But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:*

VER. 11. *For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.*

VER. 12. IV. (5). *Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.*

VER. 13. V. (6). *Thou shalt not kill.*

VOL. VII. No. 25.

VER. 14. VI. (7). *Thou shalt not commit adultery.*

VER. 15. VII. (8). *Thou shalt not steal.*

VER. 16. VIII. (9). *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*

The Lutheran mode then proceeds thus :

VER. 17. IX. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.*

X. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.*

But the other mode concludes thus :

VER. 17. (10). *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.*

It is unanimously maintained that the passage *Exod. 20 : 7—16*, beginning with : “Thou shalt not take, &c.,” and ending with the words : “. . . witness against thy neighbor,” contains *seven* commandments ; consequently either *Ver. 2—6* must contain *two* commandments, and *Ver. 17* only *one*, or else, the former passage contains *one*, and the latter, *two*. This is the point in dispute. If we can arrive at a satisfactory result respecting the former, with which we propose to begin, that result alone would be sufficient to decide whether the latter contains one or two commandments.

The division which is adopted by the modern Jews, (since the era of the Talmud) and recognized by some christian writers, representing *ver. 2* as the first “word,” and *ver 3—6* as the second, and which presents only *nine* commandments, need not now detain us. Origen, after the example of Philo and Josephus, finds the first commandment in *ver. 3*, the second in *ver. 4—6*, and, consequently, the tenth in *ver. 17*, viewed as an individual whole. This division was adopted by the Greek church, and predominates among all the Reformed churches (Presbyterian, &c.). It may be termed the *Judaico-Origenistic*, or, as we prefer, the *Græco-Reformed* division. Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand, speaks in his *Stromata* (as Prof. Kurtz remarks) of image-worship as prohibited in the first, of the profanation of the name of God as prohibited in the second, and of the sanctification of the Sabbath day as enjoined in the third commandment. In the subsequent portion of the passage, however, a certain degree of confusion prevails, as he omits the fourth command-

ment altogether, while his *tenth* embraces all that relates to "coveting." Augustine concurred with him in the first three commandments, but his ninth (adopting the order in Deuteronomy) was: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," and his tenth: "Thou — house, nor his man servant, &c." This is, strictly speaking, the *Augustinian* mode. The occidental or Western church, (Latin) as contradistinguished from the church in the East, (Oriental, Greek), adopted the leading features of this mode, with the exception that it followed the text of Exodus, and read the ninth commandment thus: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house," and the tenth thus: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor &c." This form was generally retained in Europe, even after Popery was fully developed. At the Reformation, Luther and his associates, while carefully separating the wheat from the chaff, discriminated accurately between christian and popish elements in the doctrines and usages which they found. They retained the Lord's day or Sunday, not because popery had introduced it, but because it was a holy day anterior to the origin of popery. They retained not only the general doctrine of the Trinity, but also fully coincided with the Papists, in opposition to the Greek church, in teaching that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son also (*filioque*); and the Reformed churches happily concurred with them subsequently. Thus, too, they adopted the ancient division of the Decalogue prevalent among the Papists, not because the latter recognized it, but, as in the other cases, for reasons which were entirely independent of popery. This division may be called the *Latino-Lutheran*.

The first question which we now propose, is the following: Is the Lutheran church sustained by sound exegetical principles in presenting all that appears in ver. 3—6 as *one* commandment only? Before we examine the internal evidence, one circumstance appears on the surface, which, if not decisive, at least possesses great weight. Each of the fifty-four parashahs or larger divisions of the Pentateuch, is sub-divided in the Hebrew manuscripts used in the synagogues, into smaller sections, termed *sederim*, that is, *orders* or *ranks*; these sub-divisions are indicated by the Hebrew letter S (for *setumah*, that is, *shut*) and a vacant space preceding the next word in the same line, or else by the letter P (for *petuchah*, that is, *open*) denoting that the remainder of the line is to be blank. These distinctions, which are omitted in all the versions, may be seen in printed Hebrew Bibles, and are strictly retained in the Hebrew manuscripts. The period of their origin is not now known, but it is quite possible that they are not much later

than the return from the Babylonian Captivity (536 B. C.) or the age of Ezra, and may embody traditionally the division actually made by Moses himself; the proof of the contrary cannot be furnished. Now in the Hebrew manuscripts, the whole passage, Exod. 20: 2—6 is one undivided section, followed by P, the initial letter of *petuchah*, and the same occurs in the corresponding passage in Deuteronomy; the succeeding commandments are each followed by S, the initial letter of *setumah*. This very ancient classification assigns all the words preceding: "Thou shalt not take the name, &c.," to the first commandment. The whole genius of Judaism would have repelled this arrangement with scorn, if it had proceeded from a christian source; we are constrained to assign it to a period anterior to the Talmud, which varies from these ancient marks, and adopts a division allied to the Græco-Reformed mode. Still, we are not accustomed to ascribe a very high value to the exegesis of the Jews or to their diacritical signs, and as the other marks and signs of Hebrew manuscripts impose no fetters on the interpreter, we concede that if internal evidence does not accord with this argument, the claims of the Latino-Lutheran division are somewhat feebly supported.

How many commandments will an unbiassed reader find in ver. 2—6? *One*—or *two*—or *three*? The Origenistic or Græco Reformed division recognizes *two*: a) the prohibition of polytheism in general, and, b) the prohibition of image-worship, whether of a distinct god like Moloch or Dagon, or of a symbol of Jehovah in the form of a creature. Prof. Kurtz himself finds only *one* command, containing in ver. 3, a general, and in ver. 4, a special prohibition, and it is not usual to regard the whole passage as comprehending more than at most, two divisions. The reader, however, who tests with an unbiassed mind the principle which furnishes the Origenistic division may, possibly, like ourselves, perceive that the whole passage really assumes a *tripartite* form—that is, if we deny that the whole constitutes *one* commandment, a logical necessity, and the striking historical illustrations furnished by the Scriptures, alike compel us to recognize *three* commandments. As the fundamental principle: Do thy neighbor no harm—assumes at least a fourfold form in the succeeding commandments, (kill—adultery—steal—false witness), so the fundamental principle of the passage before us, which evidently is: *Worship Jehovah alone*—assumes a threefold form: a) Thou shalt have no other gods before me; b) Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, &c.; c) Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them, &c. It is not the purpose of

the passage to institute or enjoin directly the worship of Jehovah, which duty it presupposes, since it is not addressed to a people unacquainted with his name, but to those who recognize his claim; the whole force of the words is directed solely against the sin, *in any of its forms*, of detracting from the honor which belongs to Jehovah exclusively, by setting forth additional objects of worship. Accordingly, three forms of the same sin are specified: *a*) the association of other objects of worship with Jehovah, or polytheism, strictly defined—"thou shalt have no other, &c.;" *b*) the *fabrication* of objects of worship—"thou shalt not make, &c.;" *c*) the actual worship offered to them—"thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them," where "serve" is merely an epexegetical repetition of "bow down."

Numerous instances, illustrative of the first of these specifications occur in the books of Kings and Chronicles; it will be sufficient to refer to one only—the people whom the king of Assyria placed in the cities of Samaria "feared the Lord (Jehovah) AND served their own gods, &c." (2 Kings 27: 33), as the Jews themselves had frequently done. The impious doctrine of Polytheism, viewed as the source of overt acts, is, therefore, first condemned, and the toleration of it prohibited. The second specification contains a prohibition of the *fabrication* of objects of worship. It refers to a sin entirely different in its form from the preceding, and comprehends the impious sentiments of him who connives at idolatry by furnishing or erecting objects of worship. Aaron was too intelligent to revere as a god the golden calf which *he made*, and may have tranquillized his conscience by regarding it as a symbol of Jehovah, Exod. 32: 4. Moses did not charge him with having been guilty of polytheism, but of fabricating an image, and thus conniving at, and encouraging, that conduct of the people which detracted from the honor due to Jehovah alone, Exod. 32: 21. Jeroboam also seems to have professed that his golden calves were symbols of Jehovah (1 Kings 12: 28); but the fabrication and erection of these objects constituted his "sin," which the sacred writer so frequently deplores in the history of the succeeding kings. The sentence of condemnation which the Lord pronounced in his case, described his sin in the following emphatic words: "For thou hast gone and MADE thee other gods, and molten images, to provoke me to anger, and hast cast me behind thy back." (1 Kings 14: 9). "They that *make*" idols are specially condemned in Ps. 115: 8; 135: 18. Isaiah speaks with scorn (ch. 44) of the wretched man who warms himself and bakes his bread at the fire

made of a part of the tree, of "the residue whereof he maketh a god." Demetrius of Ephesus, Acts ch. 19, was doubtless not only a skilful artificer, but also a man of great intelligence and worldly wisdom, as his position, his great influence, and the artful address which he made to the craftsmen, abundantly show; he had probably, like the intelligent men of that age, learned to see the folly of the mythological system which constituted the popular religion, and it is scarcely possible that he sincerely worshipped the goddess to whom his personal interest alone taught him to render homage. Still, he *made* articles which tended to maintain a false worship that was derogatory to the honor of God. And who are they that maintain the idolatry practiced by Papists, but artful priests? These deride in their hearts the credulity of their serfs, who would long ago have been emancipated from their thralldom, if they were not taught to worship the images which the pope and his agents, the modern silver-smiths of Ephesus, continually cause to be made. The true key to popery, which explains its image-worship and its confessional, is furnished in the words: "Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth." (Acts 19: 25.)

The third specification: "Thou shalt not bow down, &c.," then proceeds to describe with increased distinctness the impious practice of offering direct worship to other objects besides Jehovah. That this distinction is very clear and strictly logical, is demonstrated by the case of Naaman the Syrian, (2 Kings ch. 5,) whom the Savior mentions in Luke 4: 27. After the miracle of cleansing him had been wrought, he conformed to the first specification, when he confessed before Elisha: "Now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel," implying that he abandoned his polytheistic doctrines. That he designed to observe the second rigidly, and not even encourage, or contribute to, the fabrication of any image, is demonstrated by his desire to carry with him a quantity of the earth or soil of Palestine, on which he might stand in Syria, when he worshipped Jehovah; although the request may have proceeded from imperfect religious views, it indicated honesty and sincerity of heart. The third specification, however, embarrassed him; the essential difference between it and the former seems to have been instantly suggested to his own mind. His office as a personal attendant of the Syrian king, required him to support the latter when he "bowed himself" before the idol Rimmon, and the king's act of adoration necessarily required the attendant "on whose hand he leaned," to bend forward, bow or prostrate himself also. He entreats

the Lord to pardon the external bodily act, since his views and feelings did not concur with it.

We find, accordingly, *three* distinct precepts, referring to three different forms of the sin of idolatry, or the recognition of the claims of any inanimate object or living creature to man's worship, in addition to those of Jehovah. The proneness of the Israelites to idolatry, of which their whole history abounds in mournful instances, did not consist directly in a disposition to abolish the worship of the true God, whose existence and claims their infidelity does not appear to have usually denied. The temptation which exercised the greatest power over them, from the age of Solomon to the Babylonian Captivity, rather led them to combine the worship of additional deities with that of Jehovah. This circumstance accounts for the complex character of the passage before us—it refers prophetically to their conduct after they should have entered the holy land. A simple prohibition of idolatry would have been sufficient in the case of a people transplanted from idolatrous Egypt to a region surrounded by monotheistic nations: the case of Israel was the reverse. A single monotheistic people is seen in the midst of polytheistic nations, several of which had attained to a high degree of culture that naturally exercised a powerful influence on Israel. The jealous God, "whose name is Jealous," Exod. 34: 14, the only true God, to whom the future was known like the past and the present, mercifully afforded additional protection to his chosen people, by unfolding the meaning of the first specification, and closing every avenue to the entrance of idolatry, when he prohibited in the second the fabrication, and in the third the actual worship, of any-god besides himself.

Let us now assume for a moment, that the Origenistic or Reformed mode of division, which contracts ver. 17 into one commandment is correct, and proceed to compute the *number* of the commandments. Ver. 17 contains one, the preceding verses, 7—16, as all admit, contain seven; the three which we have now found, would furnish, as a result, ELEVEN commandments. As this number, however, conflicts with the statement of Moses, who finds only *ten*, we again glance at the passage, for the purpose of discovering the error in our computation. We perceive it at once when we examine the Sabbath-commandment, ver. 8—11. This also contains three specifications: *a*) "Remember, &c." *b*) "Six days shalt thou &c." *c*) "In it thou shalt not, &c." But all these sentences, referring to the same duty, confessedly constitute only *one* commandment. So too, the whole passage, ver. 2—6, is ob-

viously tripartite: one fundamental principle pervades the whole: Worship Jehovah alone. Now if such a commandment be admitted to be divine, consistent with all the truths of revelation (which none deny), and also direct and comprehensive, then it follows, that, *a*) polytheism, or the doctrine that there are more gods than one, is prohibited; for if they existed, why should they not be recognized and adored? It follows, that, *b*) the fabrication, for the purpose of worship, of any image either of another god, who really does not exist (1 Cor. 8: 4; 10: 19) or of God himself, who is a spirit, incapable of being truly represented by any material object, (John 4: 24) and whom no man hath ever seen (John 1: 18; 1 Tim. 6: 16; 1 John 1: 18) is a self-contradiction and wickedness. It follows, that, *c*) any personal act, for instance, bowing down before such an idol (the act representative of other acts of worship, sacrifices, &c.) is a direct denial of the exclusive claims of Jehovah. The inference is now plain, that as in the last commandment of all, the servant, the ox, &c., are merely examples, not constituting several distinct commandments, so in the passage before us, (precisely as in the analogous case of the Sabbath-commandment), these three prohibitions constitute *ONE* general prohibition of polytheism, specially referring, first, to the doctrine itself, secondly, to any connivance, and, thirdly, to any act, sustaining such a doctrine. Hence we are authorized to count the whole passage as a single commandment.

Seven others follow, which occasion no difficulty; we need two more, in order to complete the number Ten. Now the remainder of the series is in the following words: Verse 17. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." The Origenistic or Græco-Reformed mode is here compelled to exclude any exegetical investigation, and to assume that this verse constitutes *one* commandment, since it had already obtained nine, by assigning two to the passage of which we have now disposed. That division is, as we have seen, unquestionably erroneous; the passage necessarily contains either three precepts, referring to the same general topic, which position the Mosaic word: "Ten," forbids us to assume, or else it contains one, as the whole design or purport plainly implies. We are therefore already prepared to find two in the concluding words just quoted, either according to the Augustinian or the Latino-Lutheran mode, which agree in form, but differ in the position of two important words.

A very remarkable variation of the text in Deuteronomy from that in Exodus appears in one place, when they are compared. Both texts obviously divide the passage, ver. 17, into two commandments, by actually commencing two independent sentences ("Thou shalt not covet, &c."—"Thou shalt not covet, &c.") indicative of two entirely distinct offences.¹ The circumstance that the same word "covet" recurs, no more indicates that one commandment only is given, than the repetition of the word "neighbor" implies that the present verse and the preceding: "false witness against thy neighbor," constitute only one commandment—a combination which no one advocates. The real difficulty which we here encounter is rather occasioned by the transposition of the words "house" and "wife." The Augustinian division does not exhibit the former but the latter in its ninth commandment, thus: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife." Prof. Kurtz, in the note which suggested this article, concurs with Augustine in rejecting the Græco-Reformed division, and refers us to the elucidation of this point in the third volume of his work, which he has not yet published; he anticipates its appearance by announcing that he adopts Augustine's mode, and that the true form of the ninth commandment is, in his opinion, the one now given; the tenth, then proceeds: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his man servant, &c." He explains the variation in the two texts provisionally, by the hypothesis that it was occasioned by transcribers, and that the text in Exodus is to be amended according to the true reading in Deuteronomy. He concedes, at the same time, that the results of Kennicott's examination of the Hebrew manuscripts offer a very feeble support to this conjectural emendation.

We are by no means satisfied with this proposed alteration. The distinguished theologian whom we have mentioned, rare-

¹ It may be here mentioned incidentally that the comma in Exodus after "house," is merely a modern point, as well as that the number of the verse, 17, is also a modern arrangement, having no authority. The original text not only allows, but also seems to require the following punctuation. "Ver. 17. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house. Ver. 18. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, &c." The Hebrew word *tachmod* is used twice in Exodus, and in both cases is rendered in the authorized English version "covet." In Deuteronomy, the same word is prefixed to "wife," but another and a nearly equivalent word (*tithaveh*) is there prefixed to "house," and the whole should read in Deuteronomy thus: "Ver 21. Neither shalt thou covet thy neighbor's wife. Ver. 22. Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbor's house, his field, &c." The Septuagint regards both words as synonymous, for it employs the same word in translating them into Greek (*epithumescis*) thus using the same word four times.

ly adopts an opinion on insufficient and hazardous grounds, and it is quite possible that he may announce a change in his views in the forthcoming third volume, as he has already done in one or two analogous cases, in the preceding two volumes. We prefer to leave the two texts unaltered, to discover, if possible, a mode of reconciling the apparent discrepancy, and, if two commandments are furnished by ver. 17 (Exod. ch. 20) to search for the rationale of the distinction made between them. That the ancient people of God understood the two sentences, beginning with: "thou shalt not covet," as constituting two distinct commandments, is demonstrated by the insertion between them in the Hebrew manuscripts, of the *Setumah* mentioned above. It appears from a reference which Kurtz makes that Kennicott ascertained, after inspecting a large number of MSS. of the Old Testament, that this letter S (Samekh) was wanting in about one-third of the whole number, but occurred in the remainder. We are not informed of the details. Possibly, those manuscripts in which it is wanting, did not introduce this sign with critical accuracy in other cases. Even if they omit it in the present passage, and insert it in others, the question still demands an answer: Whence did the other and more numerous manuscripts obtain it? The jealousy, amounting even to superstition, with which the later Jews guarded against alterations both in the text and in the diacritical signs, forbids us to regard the latter in any other light than as indications of the most ancient mode of interpretation, which counted the words: "Thou—house," as the ninth commandment. We do not, however, regard this argument as decisive, and, indeed, do not need it, when other and more important considerations demand our notice. Still, it is remarkable, that both here and in the case of the first commandment, this very ancient traditional division, precisely coincides with the Latino-Lutheran mode.

We are desirous of adopting one of the two texts as the standard, and of being freed from the embarrassment occasioned by the variation in the other. The ten commandments were written twice by Jehovah himself; Moses is commanded, at the same time, to observe rigidly in the construction of the tabernacle, the pattern shown to him in the mount, (Exod. 25: 9, 40.) It may be easily perceived that if the conscience of Moses, so solemnly addressed, taught him to observe the utmost precision in the proportions and materials of the ark, table, &c., it would have scarcely allowed him to depart from the exact living words which the Divine Being had pronounced, and we rightly judge that transcribers would record these

important words with religious care and fidelity. The text in Exodus, *a transcript from the tables*, therefore presents the original unaltered order of the words. The book of Deuteronomy is well known to be a repetition of the Law, omitting many of the details of the former books, and adding others not previously prescribed. Various earlier laws are amplified, some are slightly modified, and the whole assumes the character of a spoken address or oration. When Moses repeats the Ten Words, it would be very unmeaning to assert, as Rosenmueller does, (*Scholia*, ad Deut. 5: 17—19) that he recited them simply *memoriter*, which would imply a degree of carelessness or confusion, of which a well-trained Sunday School pupil ought not to be guilty, and which would be inexcusable in one so familiar with the text as Moses was. It is more decorous to assume that he spoke paraphrastically, and inserted elucidating clauses, in accordance with the general design of the address. He expanded, for instance, the Sabbath-commandment, by specifying the ox and the ass, while he retained the word "cattle," as well as by a specific reference to the connection between the exodus of the nation and the design of the Sabbath day. In the last commandment, he appends the "field" to the "house" mentioned in Exod. 20: 17. For the purpose of retaining the concinnity of the ninth, which mentions only a single object, he temporarily places the word "wife" there, inasmuch as, *on this particular occasion*, his principal object is to impress on the minds of the people the peculiar agricultural principle, to which we shall immediately advert, and to which their present position on the threshold of the holy land gave far greater practical importance than it could possess during their sojourn in the remote region of Sinai. The fuller form in Deuteronomy is, accordingly, an explanatory repetition of the original words, and we may, in strict accordance with the principles of Biblical criticism, assume that the precise words now found in the latter book, are the precise words pronounced by Moses on that occasion. It is indeed to this amplified repetition of the Ten Words that we consider ourselves indebted for the solution of the problem of the exact division of the whole. We allude, for instance, to the word "field," which suggests the following statement:

The nomadic life of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, was not intended to characterize the history of the nation. God had designed the Jews to be an agricultural people, as all his laws and promises unequivocally demonstrated. When a pastoral people, like the Scythians or Tartars, in the course of their wanderings, conducted the herds and flocks which constituted

their property to new pasture-grounds, the latter, like the hunting-grounds of our own Indian tribes, temporarily belonged to the whole community; after they had been depastured, and the tribe had removed to another spot, these grounds were abandoned to any strangers who might in their turn claim them. Property in land cannot exist among nomads. But as soon as a pastoral tribe changes its habits, and adopts the agricultural mode of life, the right of property in land is established. "The utility, or rather necessity, of enacting some general regulations, that should secure to every individual the peaceable enjoyment of the produce he had raised, and of the ground he had cultivated and improved, is, indeed so very obvious, that it suggested itself to the first legislators. The author of the book of Job places those who remove their neighbors' land-marks at the head of his list of wicked men; and the early Greek and Roman legislators placed these marks under the especial protection of the God Terminus, and made their removal a capital offence. Society may, in fact, be said to have grown out of the institution of a right of property in land, &c., &c." Brande's Dict. art. Right of Property.

In accordance with the instructive remarks of this writer, we would expect to find that in the Mosaic Laws, which unerring and divine wisdom gave, special protection was given to property in land. Such provisions are, accordingly, made. Jehovah declared himself to be the proprietor of the soil, and the tenure by which the Israelites held it, is strikingly illustrated by some of the features of the feudal system that at one time prevailed extensively in Europe. "The land shall not be sold for ever, *for the land is mine*, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me." Lev. 25: 23. In a religious aspect, the whole soil of Palestine was holy unto the Lord: in another aspect, the Mosaic laws regulated, among other business transactions, the purchase or transfer of real estate. In order to elevate agriculture to the high rank which God designed it to hold, and to give additional distinctness to the sacred character of the soil, real estate, consisting in houses and fields (or, in modern law terms, in "lands tenements and hereditaments") was made inalienable, by certain general laws, e. g. Levit. 25: 10, 13, 24, 27, 31; ch. 27: 22—24. The laws of inheritance and of redemption, which would not permit the real estate of one tribe to be permanently acquired by another, are explicit in stating the few exceptions which may occur. The general law was clearly defined in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad, Numb. ch. 27 and ch. 36. Boaz carefully avoided an infringement of the right of redemption attaching to another.

er, Ruth 3: 12; 4: 3, &c. Naboth, who received with horror the proposal of Ahab, which implied a violation of Numb. 36: 7, was more willing to die than to alienate the inheritance of his family, 1 Kings 21: 3. Another illustration occurs in Jerem. 32: 8. Now, the ten commandments were not designed merely for the period of forty years, during the wanderings of the people in the wilderness, but also for the subsequent period of their abode in Palestine. Like many other commandments, the Ten Words refer more or less distinctly to the special providence of God, and to temporal sanctions of the law. A special blessing resting on the harvest of the sixth year of every successive series of seven, supplied the people with food for three years, including the sabbatical or seventh year, Lev. 25: 21. On the recurrence of the three great festivals, when every male among the Jews was commanded to visit Jerusalem, the country, thus left apparently defenceless, was specially secured by the Lord from hostile invasions, Exod. 34: 24. In the decalogue a similar prophetic intimation is given. The obedient child is encouraged by the promise of a long life on earth—a temporal blessing of eminent value, in the absence of the higher blessings revealed and promised by the second or better covenant. Thus, too, the commandment before us refers to the sacred character given to real estate, which is declared to be inalienable; it places a temporal interest in a religious aspect, and forbids the individual to covet that object to which he never can secure a permanent right, and the title to which, as an abiding portion of his property, can therefore be obtained only by fraud or violence, that is, by a direct violation of the divine law.

Covet not that which never can be thine own permanently, is, then, the spirit of the words: "thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house." Now the Ten Words are designed to be explicit, so that even the young, whose minds are still undisciplined, can perceive the full extent of their application. "Thou shalt not steal," is a precept informing the mature intellect, that if the minor outrage of depriving another of his money or goods, is a grievous sin, it must be a sin still more grievous to take his life. Nevertheless, the law wisely specifies this sin also: "thou shalt not kill." But the law designs to banish unholy sentiments as well as obviate unholy acts. Covetousness is a deadly sin. It implies ingratitude to God, as well as dissatisfaction with his ways, and is equivalent to the crime of rebellion against him. It as much attempts to dethrone the Almighty, as he who hates his brother is a murderer, (1 John 3: 15). The deceitful heart of man might

consent to refrain from coveting property not transferable permanently, and in consideration of such supposed self-control or self-denial, seek for an indemnity by coveting objects that are capable of being transferred from one owner to another in perpetuity; it might thus ultimately suggest fraudulent or violent means for obtaining that coveted object. A second commandment therefore places the sin of coveting in another aspect. The Jewish agriculturist who observed, for instance, a house and field in the possession of his neighbor, all of which seemed to be adapted to certain plans which he had formed respecting the improvement of the adjoining farm belonging to himself, was by no means forbidden to desire to rent them. He was perfectly at liberty to offer his neighbor an equivalent for the transfer for a period of years (to the year of jubilee) of that property, and then convert it to his own uses. He had not been guilty of covetousness in this transaction, which would receive the sanction even of the most elevated principles of Christianity. Under what circumstances would he violate the commandment prohibiting covetousness? The mode in which he might become guilty is twofold—he might, in the first place, have secretly purposed to withhold the legal equivalent, or “valuable consideration,” the price of the purchase or lease, by any fraudulent course, while he designed to take actual possession of the property; thus he would be guilty of covetousness, that is, of entertaining a desire for the possession of an object to which he had no lawful claim. Ultimately, this case could be referred to the law: “thou shalt not steal.” But he might become guilty, in the second place, (and this is the main point here contemplated) by trampling on the special law in Levit. 25: 24, &c., by which he or his heirs were required to restore the property to the family of the former owner in the year of jubilee. This law, which was evidently designed, in its civil aspects, to protect the people from the pressure of pauperism on the one hand, and from the evils of that monopoly of land on the other, which has made some of the British peers so inordinately wealthy, appears to have been practically abrogated by art, influence and cupidity during the decline of the Hebrew commonwealth. Of this particular and flagrant offence the prophets grievously complain. “Wo to them that devise iniquity . . . and they covet fields, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away, &c.” Micah 2: 1, 2; see also Isa. 5: 8. Now, even as the abolition of the defendant’s right to be tried by a jury, would seriously disturb all our own republican institutions, so the violation of this commandment appears to have had a tendency to undermine

the very foundations of society as it was constituted by Moses, and we might have consequently expected that in the original articles of the covenant between God and his people, namely, in the Decalogue, a distinct and specific law would refer to the tenure on which portions of the holy land were held. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house" was therefore designed, not only to protect the individual Jew's real estate, but with a still wider and deeper application, to preserve the whole framework of society from dissolution.

If we then regard these words as constituting the ninth commandment, the *tenth* and last would read simply thus: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." A difficulty still remains which must be removed before we can with entire satisfaction adopt this course. Do the objects here specified, really seem to be so distinct from the "house," as to constitute with propriety an independent and distinct commandment? Several considerations may here be submitted, which seem to furnish unequivocally an affirmative answer. When we carefully investigate the spirit or genius of the whole series, it is apparent that the opinion according to which the commandments on the second table are designed solely for the neighbor's benefit, is one-sided and superficial. Even those of the first table do not refer *solely* to God's honor. It could not essentially impair the glory of the great God, if in a remote planet, in a small tract on the surface of that planet, a worm of the dust should bow before an idol, or take the divine name in vain—such a loss could not really harm the Holy One, nor cast the slightest shade on the divine glory in heaven. BUT, such an act would, on the other hand, be disastrous to that worm of the dust—it would rob him of divine favor, aggravate the personal guilt which already oppressed him, and add another degree to the corruption of his heart. The commandments of the first table are, accordingly, also designed to secure man from evil, and teach him to watch over the purity of his heart, as well as they are designed to promote the glory of God. The same object is seen in the commandments of the second table. The rights of parents, the purity of married life, life itself, property and reputation, are protected in five successive commandments. But the establishment of these laws has a two-fold benevolent purpose; they protect the neighbor, it is true, but they are also designed to preserve the tempted individual himself from committing these trespasses, in view of the disastrous influence which such transgressions, committed by him, will have on *his own* heart,

in hardening it still more, and on his whole state, in which he thereby becomes an object of divine wrath. We find the same principle in the last two commandments. They both declare: "thou shalt not covet." The former, while it designs to extinguish in the individual soul that deadly feeling of discontent with his lot, which would convert him into a rebel against God, also protects the body politic or the state; for the perpetual annexation to one estate of integral portions of another, would subvert the whole structure of the Jewish civil polity. Thus one commandment at least is given as a safeguard of the state. The succeeding commandment then proceeds to complete the merciful work of the Decalogue, by forbidding a sin which seems more venial, but which also corrupts and destroys the soul.

The difficulty arising from the common practice of overlooking the vital difference between the "house" in the ninth commandment, and the objects mentioned in the final sentence, admits, further, of being removed in the following mode:—Several principles which are regarded by British and American legal writers as the glory of the Common Law, as it is usually styled, are already distinctly announced by Moses. The main features of the law of Trespass, as recognized by the courts in Pennsylvania, for instance, may, as we are informed by an eminent jurist, be easily traced in the laws enacted by Moses. By another well-known principle of the Common Law, the punishments of crimes and misdemeanors are proportioned to the "different degrees of atrociousness" in the several offences. A gradation is perceivable in the successive sections which constitute any general law on crime. Such a principle of gradation, a *major ad minus*, appears in the Decalogue. Thus, in "kill, adultery, steal &c.," the loss of life, as the greater, precedes the loss of property as the less. On the first table, the most comprehensive or the greater sin, idolatry or polytheism, precedes the minor, the profanation of the Sabbath. The same principle obtains in the last two commandments. Both forbid covetousness, precisely as all on the first table forbid irreverence toward God in descending degrees, and as the series: "kill, &c.," forbid the infliction, in diminishing degrees, of injuries on the neighbor. The last two now refer, not directly to God, nor to the neighbor, but more directly to the individual himself: "thou shalt not covet," that is, "thou shalt guard against sins, which, while they seem to refer to the creature, man, alone, at once array thee in rebellion against God." The two forms of the sin, as in the previous instances, are then arranged "according to the different degrees of atrociousness," to

use the words commonly found in preambles in the Pennsylvania laws. The "coveting" of inalienable property is a more heinous sin than the coveting of alienable property. The latter *alone* is described in the tenth commandment.

The distinction which the Common Law makes between real and personal property, is obviously founded on the distinction between things movable and immovable; it already occurs in the Decalogue. Real estate was declared by Moses to be inalienable, and in ordinary cases, merely the usufruct or temporary use, until the next year of jubilee arrived, was granted to the purchaser, or, more properly, the lessee. But personal property of every description (the precious metals and stones, cattle, &c.) could at any time be sold unconditionally or without any encumbrances. The only difficulty which now appears, arises from the mention of a "wife." Professor Kurtz denies, in the note to which we have already adverted, that she can be placed in the same category with servants, as a *mancipium* or property, and promises to prove the truth of his position in the next volume of his History of the Old Covenant, which is not yet completed. He cannot, however, refer us to sources of higher authority than the laws of Moses, and to these we accordingly direct our attention.

The Hebrew or Oriental wife of antiquity, and the christian wife of Europe or America, move in two different spheres. Their respective position and privileges are as unequal as those of an inhabitant of an eastern country, ruled by an irresponsible despot, on the one hand, and of a free citizen of England or the United States, on the other. The gospel has completely changed the relations which oriental usages established between the two sexes, and restored to the female the equal rank of which they had deprived her. An unnatural degradation of the female sex invariably results, as history demonstrates, from polygamy, which the Mosiac laws did not directly abolish, but sedulously discountenanced by many remarkable provisions; (for these, which it is not now necessary to set forth in detail, see Winer's *Bibl. Realwörterb. art. Vielweiberei*.) The toleration of the practice of collecting several lawful wives of the same husband, and several lawful concubines, necessarily extinguished all those pure and elevated sentiments, which, according to christian principles, unite one husband and one wife together in the Lord. The charms of domestic life, the holy character of conjugal love (Ephes. 5: 22—33), the sacredness of parental and filial love, were clouded or destroyed. "From the beginning," says Christ, "it was not so." (Matth.

19: 8)—polygamy was not contemplated at the original institution of marriage. After it was introduced and had become prevalent, the acquisition of a wife was regulated by principles entirely different from those which we revere. "Among the Jews, and generally, throughout the East, marriage was considered as a sort of purchase, which the man made of the woman he desired to marry." Horne's *Introd.* Vol. III. Part IV. Chap. III. p. 408. "Wives, who were thus purchased," says John, (*Bibl. Archæol.* § 153) "were too apt to be regarded as mere servants by their husbands, &c." Direct information respecting the case before us (the true position of the "wife" in the last commandment) is furnished by the chapter succeeding the one in Exodus which contains the Decalogue. The "book of the covenant which Moses read to the people, *Exod.* ch. 24, evidently contained the whole of ch. 20—23, or, the conditions of the covenant, including the Decalogue itself; the whole is an expansion of the fundamental principles expressed in the brief clauses of the Decalogue, and serves as a paraphrase or commentary. In *Exod.* 21: 7, the case is stated of a man who "sells his daughter to be a maid servant, &c." The following note of Prof. Bush (*Notes, critical and pract. on Exod.* 21: 7) explains the facts with great accuracy and precision: "It is clear from the context that when this was done, it was, usually at least, upon some engagement or expectation that the person who bought her would take her, when of age, as his wife or concubine. Her purchase as a servant was her betrothal as a wife. This is confirmed by the comment of Maimonides, who says: 'A Hebrew handmaid might not be sold but to one who laid himself under obligations to espouse her to himself or to his son, when she was fit to be betrothed.' Jarchi also on the same passage says: 'He is bound to espouse her to be his wife, for the money of her purchase is the money of her espousal.'" Such a national custom, if it does not altogether brutify, at least perverts the judgment and debases the heart. When a wife is thus regarded as an object of purchase, treated as a servant, and viewed as the personal property of her husband, it cannot occasion wonder that loose principles respecting divorces prevailed among the Jews. The character of the nation was harsh, their duties were stern, the genius of their religion was austere, their usages were unmarked by delicacy, and they could record without compunction the deeds which necessity dictated, but which a christian nation, in happier times, could not consistently perform. "We destroyed the men, and the women, and the little ones of every city; we left none to re-

main." Deut. 2: 34. The office of the executioners of God's wrath was appropriately assigned to them. Now, that the lawgiver represents the "wife" solely as any other portion of a man's personal property, coveted only for the services which she can render in the household, and not as an object of carnal and impure desires, is demonstrated by the fact that a previous commandment ("adultery") already refers to the sin of coveting her as a female and not as property. When such views prevail, as derogatory to the man's honor who entertains them, as to the woman's dignity who suffers from them, we may understand that it was indeed "because of the hardness of their hearts" as Christ says, (Matth. 19: 8) that Moses suffered the Jew to part with a wife by simply furnishing her with a writing or "bill of divorcement," (Deut. 24: 1, &c.) How could the sanctity of marriage be established on christian principles in that age among a people accustomed to believe that the marriage tie was scarcely stronger than the bond existing between the head of the family and any personal property, such as a servant or an ox? Thus the wife was literally reduced to the level of her husband's servants and cattle; she might be transferred from his jurisdiction at any time, and become the lawful wife of another, as the cattle of her first husband might become permanently the property of another. It was quite consonant with such usages, that the Jewish widow could not inherit by law, as it is well known, any portion of her deceased husband's property; she was commended to the generosity of her sons, it is true, but she was as dependent and as destitute of property of her own, as the servants themselves, and hence it is not surprising that the prophets frequently complain of the unfeeling and cruel manner in which widows were treated. The want of civil rights, such as the gospel was really the means of giving to the female, actually placed her in the same category with the husband's servants and other property.

The repetition of the phrase: "thou shalt not covet," which would be altogether inexplicable, if the whole of ver. 17 constituted one commandment, is now easily explained. The Decalogue adopts the descending scale, in the enumeration of specific offences belonging to one general class, in order to obviate all dishonest evasions. In the case of "coveting," the sin which that term embraces, may be committed in many forms. The lawgiver comprehends the whole in *two* commandments. Guard—says he—against the sin of coveting that to which thou hast no rightful claim. Beware of that sin, first of all, when thou art tempted to seize objects which

never can be permanently thine own. But, secondly, guard against the sophistry of the corrupt human heart, and covet not even those objects which may be lawfully transferred to thee as thy permanent property. Thy sin may seem to thee to be venial, if thou canst succeed in alienating thy neighbor's wife, or servant, or cattle or other personal property, seeing that all these may be legally transferred. Thou art therefore commanded to watch over thy heart, since thou art now taught that *all* coveting is a grievous sin. This sense, which we find in the lawgiver's words, is emphatically expressed by that division of the Decalogue, which presents the whole of ver. 17 in the following form, according to the Latino-Lutheran mode :

Com. IX. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.*

Com. X. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor &c.*

The distribution of the contents of the Decalogue, when two tables alone are designed to contain them, was unquestionably made according to the principle of their internal coherence. The first table contained the duties referring to God. the second, those referring to man, beginning with : "Honor thy father, &c." The arrangement of Philo, with whom R. Stier seems to agree, cannot possibly be correct. The latter (Reden Jesu, II. 412, 413) thinks that if we are only able and willing to read, we must find an undeniably clear decision of the question in Math. 22 : 39, 40. He divides the ten commandments into two pentades, and thus places the fourth, or his fifth : "Honor, &c.," on the first, because, as he says, parents are the human representatives and images of God. To this arrangement, for which we cannot find a single substantial argument, and which may be demonstrated to be unnatural by many considerations, our present purpose does not require us to advert in detail. It would not, perhaps, be unjust to adopt Stier's own method of disposing of some of his opponents, by saying, for instance, that the results of this mode of distribution may be seen in an exaggerated form in the Chinese worship of ancestors, established by Confucius (Koung-Tsee) on the one great and only moral and religious duty of *filial piety*. It is more usual, we believe, to assign, according to the Græco-Reformed or Origenistic mode, four or a tetrad to the first, and six or a hexade to the second table, while our own mode, the Latino-Lutheran, arranges the whole ten into two classes, a triad and a heptade, the former, or three, embracing the duties referring to God, the latter, or seven, those referring to man.

In the interpretation of the Old Testament, there is an exegetical element found in the symbolical meaning of certain numbers or numeral words, which frequently renders important services. The oriental mind, according to Prof. Kurtz, and some of the most eminent recent theologians (Bähr, Hengstenberg, Bertheau, Baumgarten, &c.) regarded the number TEN as the symbol of completeness or perfection; and the emphasis with which the lawgiver speaks of "Ten Words" indicates his design of expressing the thought, conformably to the common view of the Israelites, that these words were perfectly and fully adapted to the basis of the covenant made with them. The numbers four and six are also significant, but have no special religious associations connected with them. The two numbers which our division furnishes, a triad and a heptade, are, on the contrary, repeatedly presented, in the Old Testament particularly, as *sacred* numbers. Thus, the number *Three* is distinguished, not only in consequence of its reference to the Holy Trinity, but also to many deeds and events directly connected with the three Divine Persons. The number *seven*, which is so remarkably prominent in the whole sacred and, specially, in the festival service of the Mosaic law, is also otherwise distinguished in the Scriptures as a sacred number, in things which involve man and his interests. It cannot be doubted, accordingly, that *three* of the whole *ten* words, occupied the first table, referring to God, and *seven*, beginning with "Honor, &c.," were inscribed on the *second*, referring to man.

It is frequently supposed that inasmuch as a different usage prevails among the several denominations in the United States, which, in the aggregate are here more numerous than the members of the Lutheran church, and as the precise division of the Decalogue is seemingly unimportant, it would be expedient if the church in this country should abandon her venerable usage, and adopt a foreign one. We are by no means prepared to exhibit this apparent liberality of sentiment. We should certainly be surprised to discover that our mother, the Lutheran church, had been so imperfectly educated, that religious organizations subsequently formed, were required to become her teachers at this late day. In this dark world of sin, every single ray of divine light, every particle of truth is precious—too precious to be ever resigned. There certainly *was* a mode of division which Moses received directly from God, since he counted *ten* words—it was as certainly not the Originistic, which really furnishes only nine, or else eleven, or even twelve, if "coveting" occurs in two. After examining

other modes of division, and vainly attempting to account for them satisfactorily, we have found none so consistent with itself and scriptural, so logical and significant as the old established Lutheran mode. We can recognize the impress of divinity upon it, and would fear lest we should touch it with a profane hand, by assimilating it to any other form. We so learned the Decalogue in childhood, and our riper judgment has taught us to revere its Lutheran form. Honest attention to adverse arguments has failed to convince us of their truth, and we fervently hope that the Lutheran Catechism, that precious volume, on which the blessing of God so signally rests, will always exhibit that division of the Decalogue which it has hitherto maintained, and which is, in our view, invested with a sacred character.

ARTICLE VI.

GENERAL SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

Seventeenth Session, June 14, 1855. Dayton Ohio.

THE General Synod of our church has just closed its seventeenth convention, at the place above mentioned. Availing ourselves of a brief space in our Review, which is not otherwise claimed, we purpose to give a hasty sketch of its doings. In the absence of documents, we shall mainly rely on memory, designing hereafter to complete our history of the General Synod by statistical information. This was the first meeting, which had occurred west of the Alleghany mountains, but as the city in which it took place is very accessible by railroads from every quarter, it was well attended. The different synods had their respective quotas of delegates in attendance, with the exception of the more Southern. There was, too, a large number of ministers present who were not commissioned by the church. The city selected for this meeting is admirably adapted to receive and entertain a large ecclesiastical council. With a population exceeding twenty thousand, with the elements of the highest prosperity, wealthy, and in the midst of a most beautiful and fertile country, its citizens extensively under christian influence, of different denominations, in the spirit of the finest christian hospitality, opened their habita-

tions and ministered to the saints. Long will their kindness be remembered, and the participants of it implore blessings on their heads!

On Thursday, the 14th of June, according to previous appointment, the synod was opened at 9 o'clock, A. M., in the Lutheran church, under the pastoral care of the Rev. P. Rizer, with a sermon on the coming of Christ's kingdom, by the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D., of the Gettysburg Theological Seminary. The absence of the Rev. Dr. Bachman, the President of the preceding synod, devolved this duty on Dr. Schmucker.

After the discourse, the organization of the body took place, in the usual mode, by the legitimation of delegates, and the election of officers. The Rev. A. Lochman, of the West Pennsylvania delegation, was chosen President, Rev. B. Sadtler, of the East Pennsylvania delegation, Secretary, and P. Michler, Esq., of Easton, Pa., Treasurer.

The completion of the organization opened the way for the admission of new synods. Three applied. In reference to two of them there was no difficulty, and they were at once and unanimously admitted. The case of the Central Synod of Pennsylvania was somewhat peculiar, and objections were made to its recognition. The grounds of objection were, that having till a recent period, constituted a part of the synod of West Pennsylvania, it had, without any notification of its purpose, without any consultation, and entirely without the sanction of the body of which it was a component part, been brought into existence. The Constitution of the General Synod requires a regular formation, and proposes to receive, on application, all regularly constituted synods. It was urged by the delegates of the new synod, that their purpose to form a separate body had been hastily originated, that they deemed it essential to the interests of their churches, that the organization should not be delayed, and that they supposed, as the General Synod's constitution does not specify in what a regular organization consists, they had not violated its provisions. It was further alleged that the kindest feelings existed on the part of the new synod towards the brethren from whom they had departed, and an anxious desire was expressed to be enrolled in the brotherhood of the church, and to partake in the privileges and duties of the general church association. On the other hand, it was maintained that the procedure was irregular and discourteous, that in the absence of a law for the organization of new synods, there is in the church an established usage, which was violated in this case, and which placed

the organization beyond the pale of a proper recognition by the General Synod, and that the precedent would be destructive of order and good fellowship in the church. A third line of argument, which was urged with much zeal was, that whilst the whole proceeding was wrong, the General Synod could not take cognizance of it, but bound to receive the applying body, it must leave its disciplinary treatment to the synod from which it had gone out.

Reference of the subject to a committee, was followed by a recommendation that, although the formation of the synod was not entirely regular, it be admitted, which, after some debate, was adopted, and the Central took its place in the General Synod.

It may here be stated, that this case gave rise to a report from a committee, appointed for the purpose, designed to prevent the recurrence of similar difficulties. On the basis of the report, and its recommendations, the synod laid down certain principles, which in future are to guide in the formation of synods. They are substantially, that all the parties concerned are to be consulted, and to give their sanction, and that divisions shall be made, not on the principle of "elective affinity," but on geographical grounds.

Amongst the important questions brought up and acted upon at this meeting, we mention the following, not in the order of their occurrence, but as they may be reproduced by recollection. The Liturgical committee having recommended the correction of the liturgical forms by the synod, and the issue of a new edition, the liturgical question was taken up, and gave rise to expressions of opinion, various in their character. It seemed to be conceded that the General Synod's Liturgy does not meet the wants of the church. In view of this fact, and that the General Synod, after the labor of many years, had reached no satisfactory result, it was the judgment of some that the whole matter should be relinquished, and left to district synods, several of which already have liturgies of their own in use.

On the other hand, it was replied, that the synod having devoted so much time and labor to this work, ought not to abandon it, that a successful issue was not impossible, and that a general liturgy, for the sake of uniformity, to be used in all our churches, was highly desirable. It was further urged that the Pennsylvania Synod having completed, after immense labor, its liturgy, it might be employed in meeting the defects of the General Synod's book. It was decided that the committee should be continued, and enlarged, by the addition of a mem-

ber from each of the district synods in connection with the General Synod, that the work should be carried forward, and that respect should be had to the liturgy of the Pennsylvania Synod. A small edition, for present use, of the liturgy was ordered to be printed.

To us it appears, that the conviction is extending itself more and more, that our church is liturgical, that such forms ought to constitute a part of our public worship, and that there should be uniformity in their use. Difficulties are, doubtless, in the way, but prudence and moderation will, we think, overcome them. The presumption is, that the next General Synod will be extensively engaged with this subject, and if we mistake not, it is one of the most difficult which is placed within its councils. Another question of interest, on which there was a report, but which gave rise to no discussion, was the licentiate system, as it exists in our church. Originating under peculiar circumstances, which no longer exist, and presenting some anomalies, which neither accord, it is supposed, with the New Testament, nor general ecclesiastical usage, the synod of Pennsylvania, in which it commenced, have called in question the propriety of its continuance, but before their final action, submitted the question to the General Synod, in order that a uniform system might be introduced. The course adopted was a temperate expression of the character of the license system, both on the side of its advantages and its irregularities, and a reference of it to the respective synods, that at a future synod, under a general expression from their constituents, the recommendation may be issued. We regard this as a very important question, and hope that it will receive the attention of the church, and be brought to a conclusion sanctioned by the word of God.

The report of the treasurer on the pastors' and widows' fund gave rise to numerous remarks on the importance of such a fund, its increase, and the methods by which it can be effected. Union of all the synods, combination of the various funds now existing, and effort to secure donations, were presented as the means, and recommendations bearing on these points were passed. An executive committee, resident in the city of Philadelphia, was appointed to superintend this interest.

One of the most interesting subjects, which occupied the attention of the synod, was the establishment of a colonization mission on the western coast of Africa. The plan proposed by the Rev. Mr. Officer, is the education, in a school

established for the purpose, of colored people in the United States, who are to be employed, in connection with the colonization of free blacks, in propagating the gospel in heathen Africa. The leading argument for the plan is, the fatality of the climate to white missionaries. The scheme was advocated with ability and eloquence, and no serious impediments were presented. The committee to whom the measure was referred, and whose report was adopted, endorsed the plan, and recommended movements adapted to meet the opportunities which might occur for carrying it into effect.

The establishment of a Publication Society for issuing Lutheran works, original and translated, and other purposes, having been presented to the General Synod for its sanction, after much debate, it was decided, that whilst such an organization, already existing, and having commenced operations, is viewed with favor by the General Synod, it cannot receive for its publications any imprimatur from it, till it shall have some official relation to it. In regard to the Lutheran Almanac to be published by this company, it, with that published under the auspices of Mr. T. N. Kurtz, is left to win its way to favor by its own intrinsic merits.

A resolution was passed disapproving of the building of union churches, on the ground that such churches tend rather to disunion.

The report of the directors of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Adams Co., Pa., presented that institution in a favorable light, as prospering, as free from embarrassment, as having had a considerable increase of students, during the past year, as employing the entire time of two professors, whom it has funds to sustain, and as having a large and valuable theological library. It may be mentioned, in addition, that the services of an additional professor are expected soon, in the department of German, under the appointment of the Pennsylvania synod.

An important part of the business transacted during the meetings of the General Synod, grows out of the existence of various benevolent societies, such as the Foreign Missionary, the Home Missionary, the Education Society, and the Church Extension Society. To these may be added, though differing from them, the Historical Society. These general associations hold business meetings and anniversaries, present reports and collect funds, during the sessions of the synod. We mention, 1st, the Foreign Missionary Society. At the meeting of this society, the corresponding secretary, the Rev. Mr. Senderling, read an interesting report, presenting a detailed account of the

operations of the society, during the past two years. The report is printed and published, and will be circulated in the churches. The anniversary meeting in the Lutheran church, was exceedingly animated; addresses were made, and about four hundred dollars collected. The widow of the lamented Gunn, and her two children, were present, and the latter gave specimens of the Telooogo language, by reading and singing in it.

The Home Missionary Society's meetings for business and encouragement, furnished ample evidence of the zeal and success with which that important department of benevolent operation is carried on. Collections and subscriptions were made to the amount of about one thousand dollars. An individual well qualified for the work, was appointed as general secretary and superintendent of this society, whose whole time is to be devoted to its interests. Numerous facts presented during the meeting of the synod, show that Home Missions demand vigorous efforts, but that in order to conduct them on the proper scale, ministers are much needed.

The Education Society transacted its business and held its anniversary. The report of the corresponding secretary exhibited a depressed condition of this enterprise. Difficulties connected with the organization, embarrassed the operations. A plan was adopted, by which it is supposed the operations will be more equalized, and its energies diffused. The result of this remodelling of the society was highly exhilarating, and it was manifested in the large contribution at the anniversary meeting, amounting to sixteen hundred dollars for the payment of the debt.

The details of the plan, we deem it unnecessary to give. The different synods will become auxiliary societies, employ committees at the institutions, where they educate, designate beneficiaries and be responsible for their support. The general committee will exercise a general supervision, and more particularly take charge of all surplus funds, and distribute them, at each meeting of the General Synod, to the different institutions, in the ratio of their beneficiaries.

The Church Extension Society, at its meeting, ascertained, that the effort in that behalf had fallen much below expectation, that various hindrances had been in the way of success, but undiscouraged, it resolved to employ the funds in hand for the aid of churches, by lending them money on interest with good security, and by pushing forward with the utmost vigor the collection of the amount still needed to complete the sum (\$50,000) first proposed.

The orator of the Historical Society having failed to perform, the report of the Curator was read, and the Rev. Mr. Diehl was appointed to represent the society in an address at the next meeting.

The feeling of the brethren was universal, that this meeting of the General Synod, was not only delightful in itself, but that much important business, in the best spirit, had been transacted. It showed our church as possessing much strength, and as marching forward to great results. It exhibited, with some diversity of view on minor points, a strong spirit of union.

The closing exercises were beautiful and touching; the tribute to the memory of Dr. J. G. Schmucker, one of the fathers of the synod, the announcement of the recent death of the aged brethren, Hemping and Ulrich, of the Pennsylvania synod, the parting hymn, and then the separation from beloved brethren, who had indeed taken sweet counsel together, and from the generous friends who had done so much to make our stay in Dayton pleasant, cannot be described, cannot be forgotten.

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Physical Geography of the Sea. By M. F. Maury, LL. D., Lieut. U. S. Navy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 329 and 331, Pearl Street, Franklin Square.—1855.

THROUGH the idea of this work, and its publication, Lieut. Maury has rendered himself an object of interest, and acquired an enviable reputation, among all the nations that possess a navy and a merchant-marine. It presents the combined result of the experiences, heretofore buried in logbooks, of a vast number of ship-masters, for a long series of years past; but, what is still more important, of regular observations, sent in, at the request of the author, by American commanders generally, at the end of every cruise, and upon the invitation of the United States' Government, by a great number of other maritime states. The primary object of "the Wind and Current-Charts," out of which has grown this Treatise on the Physical Geography of the Sea, was, "to collect the experience of every navigator as to the winds and currents of the ocean, to discuss his observations upon them, and then to present the world with the results on charts for the improvement of commerce and navigation." These observations have reference to the winds and currents, not only of different seasons, but of several distinct periods of each

season: other important matters respecting the sea entered afterwards into consideration. The results of all these published observations have already been most important; distances have been greatly reduced, and dangers diminished. It would, indeed, be impossible to form an adequate estimate of the benefits that have already accrued, and are yet to accrue, to mankind, from the labors of Lieut. Maury, aided as they now are by the united coöperation of all nations, "in carrying out one system of philosophical research with regard to the sea." The text is illustrated by a large number of plates and charts. The work, although intended for the use of those who "follow the sea," has a deep interest for men of science generally, and reflects no little credit upon the author and the body of which he is a distinguished member.

Travels in Europe and the East: a year in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Syria, Palestine and Egypt. By Samuel Irenaeus Prime. With Engravings. In two volumes. New York: Harper and Brothers.—1855.

WE have read these volumes with deep interest. The author is well known to the religious community of this country, as the able editor of the *New York Observer*. The route over which he travelled is often taken, and has been often described. But our traveller never mounts the rostrum, and never lectures; the easy flow of his narrative, as he communicates to us the impressions made upon him by the scenes and passing events of the old world, charms us, and carries us so pleasantly along, and makes us feel as if we were ourselves passing over the route in the company of an agreeable friend, enjoying his conversation, and entering with him into the interest, grave or cheerful, of every varied incident. And there is a freshness in Mr. Prime's narrative, a pointedness and aptness of reflection upon everything observed, all deeply tinged with a habitual tone of religious thought and feeling, which render the work exceedingly attractive, interesting and instructive. It cannot fail to afford our readers the same gratification which we have derived from its perusal.

Harper's Statistical Gazetteer of the World, particularly describing the United States of America, Canada, and Nova Scotia. By J. Calvin Smith. Illustrated by seven Maps. New York: Harper and Brothers.—1855.

THIS work received a brief notice in our *Quarterly*, when its publication in numbers had just commenced. The public have now been for some time in possession of the complete work. That a new *Gazetteer*, adapted to the altered aspects of the world and the progress of nations, and especially the rapid advance of our own country in material prosperity, has long been a desideratum, will be readily admitted. We believe that the work before us most satisfactorily supplies this desideratum. In its preparation, every accessible and available source of information, as regards localities, geographical relations, statistical details, &c., has been largely laid under contribu-

tion, as well in respect of the old world as of the new, and a vast amount of valuable and interesting matter has thus been accumulated. A conspicuous feature of this work is to enter the proper name of each place in strictly alphabetical order, as it appears in the language of the country, viz: Dutch, French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish names are written and accentuated on this plan, and the rendered English names will be found immediately following; as, Aachen (Aix la Chapelle); Wien (Vienna); &c. &c. The most important places in ancient geography, such as towns of which ruins remain, have been inserted in proper order, and the ancient names of modern places have been given, where ascertained. The old provinces of France, the Netherlands, and Spain, the Circles of the German Empire, and the countries forming the French empire under Napoleon, which are now superseded by other divisions, but still often referred to, are described in the order of the alphabet. In so far as space would admit, accurate notices have been given of the geology and physical geography, the meteorological and mineralogical conditions of the countries and districts. Great care has been taken to ascertain the true elevation of mountains above the level of the sea, and, wherever foreign authorities have been relied on, their measurements have been rendered into English equivalents." "With regard to the part relating to the American continent, a large amount of new matter will be found incorporated, rendering it more complete than any other similar work extant." We have carefully tested the accuracy of the work in a number of instances, and are confident that its ample contents, including a number of valuable maps, will fully meet every reasonable demand of an intelligent public.

The Footsteps of St. Paul. By the author of "Morning and Night Watches," "The Words of Jesus," "The Mind of Jesus," "Family Prayers," "The Great Journey," "Woodcutter of Lebanon." New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, No. 285, Broadway.—1855.

THE author, regarding all the larger commentaries as little fitted to interest and instruct younger students, has written this book for the special benefit of this class of readers. Notwithstanding this is its specific design, we have ourselves read it through with the deepest interest, and to our great edification. Although drawing largely from other elaborate and valuable works, the author has employed sufficient independent research and thought, to redeem his work from the unattractive character of a mere compilation. His design has been, to offer to young people a work which would tend, by combining historical and biographical instruction, to attract them to a more careful and devout study of the Word of God. What nobler model could be selected in this respect for the youthful mind—what history more replete with stirring interest and noble spiritual lessons, than the life of 'the scholar of Gamaliel?' In following the great apostle of the Gentiles through the whole of his career, from his youth to his martyrdom, the author avails himself of all the information furnished by history, geography and science, and of every circumstance which the manners, customs, institutions, and Jewish and pa-

gan superstition and learning, as well as cautious conjecture and just inference can supply, to invest his narrative of that great and momentous life with the profoundest, often thrilling, interest, while thus, at the same time, a great amount of most important and pleasing instruction is communicated. We commend the work to our laity, as most profitable, edifying and delightful, and would rejoice to see it in the hands of every family in the land.

Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the royal succession of Great Britain. By Agnes Strickland, author of the "Lives of the Queens of England." Vol. V. New York: Harper and Brothers.—1855.

Of this work, which we have already noticed repeatedly in our pages, the fifth volume is before us. It continues the life of Mary Stuart, without bringing it to a conclusion. We again assure our readers that this biography is not a skilful and specious plea of one woman sympathizing with the misfortunes of another, to whom historians generally have given a bad reputation. The indefatigable and thorough researches of the author into the mass of official records relating to the period, have enabled her to present the unfortunate queen of Scots in a vastly different light from that in which she has so long been regarded: she has most triumphantly confuted the misrepresentations of Buchanan and other prejudiced witnesses, and the slanders and infamous lies of Elizabeth's and Murray's hired tools, by means of irrefutable documentary evidence; and hereafter no writer can have any further excuse for continuing to vilify the character of one, whose unmerited misfortunes demand for it the amende honorable from enlightened and candid posterity. The book is most ably written, and exceedingly interesting.

The Bible Prayer Book: for Family Worship and for other private and public occasions. By W. W. Everts, author of "Bible Manual," "Pastor's Handbook," etc. New York: Ivison and Phinney, 178 Fulton Street, &c.—1855.

THE plan of this work is, to furnish not only a series of general prayers for private, domestic and public use, but a large number of forms of worship and prayer for particular occasions, and connected with particular subjects, such as the Divine Attributes, the separate petitions of the Lord's prayer, the several commandments of the Decalogue, the Beatitudes, and others suited to particular times, circumstances and experiences. Without commending everything in the book, we regard the general plan of bringing forms of prayer into direct connexion with Scripture, and thus providing for almost every conceivable occasion, as most happy: we think the idea has, on the whole, been very successfully carried out: the prayers exhibit a very earnest and truly devotional spirit: if the language is not always such as we would prefer, it is, in general, very appropriate, and to a great degree that of Scripture, and we cannot doubt that the volume will be favorably received by the religious community, and afford welcome aids, as well as true comfort and edification to great numbers of those who duly appreciate the privilege of prayer.

The Chemistry of Common Life. By James F. Johnston, M. A., F. R. S., F. G. S., etc., etc. Author of "Lectures on Agricultural Chemistry and Geology," "A Catechism of Agricultural Chemistry and Geology," etc. Illustrated with numerous wood engravings. In two volumes. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 346 and 348, Broadway.—MDCCCLV.

THIS is a most admirable work. Its design is, to supply the necessity for a popular Chemical Literature, which arises from the defectiveness or total want of instruction, at home and in the schools, concerning those wonders, chemical and physiological, of which the common life of man is full. To give a very brief summary: it treats, in their natural order, of the air we breathe, and the water we drink, in their relations to human life and health; of the soil we cultivate and the plant we rear: the liquors we ferment: the narcotics we indulge in: the odors we enjoy and the smells we dislike: what we breathe for and why we digest: the body we cherish: the circulation of matter. Under these general heads, so briefly stated here, a vast amount of most valuable and important instruction is communicated, in a style and manner most interesting, with great copiousness of detail and aptness of illustration. Although designed for popular use, the work is also intended to supply a manual for schools. It is undoubtedly one of the most valuable and interesting scientific works for general circulation that have recently proceeded from the press, and should be found in every family that can afford time and money for the acquisition of useful knowledge.

Literary and Historical Miscellanies. By George Bancroft. New York: Harper and Brothers.—1855.

THIS volume, containing miscellaneous writings from the pen of the distinguished historian of the United States, came too late to hand to receive from us that careful examination which it well deserves. First there are three Essays: I. The Doctrine of Temperaments: II. Ennui: III. The Ruling Passion in Death. These are replete with acute speculations, keen glances into the hidden depths of the human heart, and beneath the surface of human character, original views, aptly and strikingly illustrated from the pages of history. Next come Studies in German Literature: I. General Characteristics; II. The Revival of German Literature; III. Men of Science and Learning; IV. The age of Schiller and Goethe; V. Translations. These are characterized by extensive and, in general, accurate knowledge, and a just and generous appreciation of the labors, the learning, and the poetry of the Germans, and by enlightened and genial criticisms. But we cannot always assent to our author's judgments; Jean Paul, for instance, he utterly fails to comprehend or appreciate. The translations are faithful and scholarly performances, not distinguished for deep poetic inspiration. While we greatly admire these elegant "Studies," we most decidedly dissent from some of the views expressed by the author. Next come Studies in History: I. Economy of Athens. II. Decline of the Roman People: III. Russia. IV. The Wars of Russia and Turkey. These abound in most satisfactory results of learned research and careful reflection, in sagacious

deductions and acute generalizations, and communicate a great mass of most valuable information. Lastly, we have Occasional Addresses, elegant compositions sparkling with gems of varied lore, abounding in large views, presenting candid, liberal and generous criticisms of eminent men, and rising frequently into the region of high, manly and earnest eloquence. To what extent we should subscribe to the views of our author, our cursory examination of these writings forbids us to determine; but the reader may be assured, that he will find them worthy the reputation of our distinguished fellow-citizen.

A New Method of learning the French Language; embracing both the analytic and synthetic modes of Instruction; being a plain and practical way of acquiring the art of Reading, Speaking and composing French. On the plan of Woodbury's Method with German. By Louis Fasquelle, LL. D., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Michigan. Twentieth Edition. New York: Ivison and Phinney, 178 Fulton Street; Chicago: S. C. Griggs and Co., 111 Lake St.; Buffalo: Phinney and Co., 188 Main St.; Auburn: J. C. Ivison and Co.; Detroit: A. McFarren; Cincinnati: Moore, Anderson and Co.—1855.

A Key to the Exercises of Fasquelle's New French Method. With occasional Notes and References to the Rules.

Translation, Composition, Conversation. The Colloquial French Reader: or, Interesting Narratives in French, for Translation, accompanied by conversational exercises. With grammatical and Idiomatical references to Fasquelle's New French Method, the explanation of the most difficult passages, and a copious vocabulary.

Napoleon, par Alexandre Dumas. For the use of Colleges and Schools. With conversational exercises, explanatory Notes, and references to the "New French Method," on the plan of Fasquelle's French Reader.

Les Aventures de Telemaque, Fils d'Ulysse. Par Fenelon. With grammatical and idiomatical references to Fasquelle's "New French Method," and the explanation of the most difficult words and passages.

WE have grouped together the above named works by the same author, and from the press of the same publishers, for the purpose of expressing at once our opinion of the whole series. In a former number we noticed Woodbury's series in the same manner, and, as the same method of instruction is adopted here, the remarks made there will, mutatis mutandis, apply in the present instance. For communicating a practical acquaintance with any modern language, for imparting a command of its idioms and any degree of facility and correctness in speaking and writing it, we regard this method as decidedly the best that is known to us. Perhaps the foreign ear accustoms itself

with so much difficulty to the sounds of no modern language, when spoken rapidly by a native, as to those of the French. To overcome this obstacle is an object, therefore, which the author has everywhere had in view: with the exercises for reading and translation given in the works 3d and 4th in the list above, he accordingly connects conversational exercises in French questions, to be answered in French by the student: a plan which can, with a good teacher, scarcely fail to prove most effectual. The references given in all the three readers to the "New Method," as they tend to keep fresh in the student's memory, and, as we may be allowed to say, at his tongue's end, all the phrases and idiomatic expressions learnt in that primary work, constitute an important element in this plan of instruction. The lessons for reading and translation in the Reader are interesting and entertaining; the life of Napoleon, by Dumas, is a very popular text-book; and the colloquial exercises given at the end of the lessons in the former, and of the sections in the latter, are exceedingly well adapted to keep the pupil's grammatical knowledge on the *qui vive*, and to store his memory with the conversational phraseology of the French. We are glad to find that Prof. Pasquelle has given us a new edition of that beautiful and noble work of Fenelon, *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, in preference to anything more modern.

The author has shown his judgment and experience, by combining, in the primary work, the analytic and synthetic methods: while the latter alone can affect little more than facility in reading and translating, the former without this is apt to induce careless habits of expression, uncertain and partial knowledge, and confirmed grammatical inaccuracy. Altogether we regard this series as eminently adapted to the purposes of instruction, and under the guidance of a skilful instructor, pupils can scarcely fail to acquire a thorough and practical acquaintance with that precise and elegant language which it is designed to teach.

The American Debater: Being a plain Exposition of the Principles and Practice of public debate: wherein will be found an account of the qualifications necessary to a good deliberative orator, as also the mode of acquiring them, the rules of order observed in deliberative assemblies, debates in full, and in outline, on various interesting topics, numerous questions for discussion, forms of a Constitution for Literary Clubs or Debating Societies, etc., etc. By James N. McElligott, LL. D., author of "The Analytical Manual," "Young Analyzer," etc. New York: Iverson and Phinney, 178 Fulton Street, &c.—1855.

THIS strikes us as an exceedingly useful book, especially in a country like ours, where every man possessed of any degree of intellectual culture is liable to be placed in circumstances, where the instructions here communicated will be welcome and advantageous. The author begins with discussing the question, "What is a good Debater?" and here he lays down general principles as just as they are important, enforcing them by frequent references to high authorities and distinguished examples, ancient and modern. His views respecting extemporaneous speaking, and the rules which he gives for ac-

quiring skill and effectiveness in this valuable art, are founded on good sense and the experience of great speakers: this, and all the other matter contained in the volume, will be found valuable to all who have occasion to speak in public and participate in the proceedings of deliberative bodies: full debates are given, admirably illustrating the manner in which such concerns are conducted: the great number of subjects for debate, which are presented, with and without references, will be most acceptable to societies organized for such purposes. We regard this as a well-timed and truly valuable production.

Sanders' New Speller, Definer and Analyzer: embracing a progressive Course of Instruction in English Orthography and Orthoepey, on the Principles of Dr. Webster: copious Exercises in Definition: an Analysis of English derivative and compound words: the whole interspersed with appropriate reading lessons, carefully adapted to the experienced wants of Schools and Academies of all grades. By Charles W. Sanders, A. M. New York: Ivison and Phinney, &c.—1855.

We had occasion, a number of years ago, to test and acknowledge the superior merits of Sanders' New Series of School Books. To this he has now added the volume named above, which, in its whole plan, in its definitions and explanations, in the progressive exercises for spelling and reading, illustrative of the letters and sounds of our language properly classified, in the explanations and exercises exhibiting the various processes by which the derivation and composition of words is effected in English, and in every material point of view, is a most admirable school book.

The Story of the Peasant-Boy Philosopher: or, "a child gathering pebbles on the Seashore." (Founded on the early life of Ferguson, the Shepherd-boy Astronomer, and intended to show how a poor lad became acquainted with the principles of Natural Science.) By Henry Mayhew. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square.—1855.

THE author's design in writing this admirable little work was, not so much to teach, as to create in youth a *taste* for learning, to awaken a thirst for knowledge, and to stimulate a spirit of inquiry: to provoke and guide the faculty of *active* attention, as distinguished from mere *receptivity*, which it is, in our schools, too much the fashion to cram: in general, to excite the youthful mind to earnest and laborious *effort* in the pursuit of knowledge. Not only is the volume admirably adapted to the attainment of these ends, but, while it will doubtless prove deeply interesting to young people, its very simple and clear explanations and lucid illustrations of some of the most important facts and principles of natural philosophy and astronomy are well suited to enlighten older heads that have never acquired correct notions of such subjects. We commend the volume to the favorable notice of parents.

The Singing Book for Boys' and Girls' Meetings : a collection of easy Songs and Tunes. By William B. Bradbury, author of the "Singing Bird," "Musical Gems," "Sabbath School Melodies," "Psalmista," "The Shawm," and various other musical works. Issued under the auspices of the New York Children's Aid Society. New York : Ivison and Phinney, 178 Fulton St.

Mr. Bradbury's meritorious connection with the promotion and culture of popular music in this country is well known. In publishing this very copious collection of easy songs and tunes, in a very cheap volume, he has rendered important service to the rising generation and the community at large. The greater cultivation of taste and skill in vocal music among our people is an object much to be desired, and involving more important benefits than mere enjoyment. Not only does the volume contain a very large number of fine popular tunes, but the sentiments conveyed by the songs are unexceptionable, and calculated to improve the heart, and to inspire it with the love of all goodness. We hope it may have an immense circulation.

Fiction. The Castle-Builders. By the author of "Heartsease," "The Heir of Red Clyffe," "Scenes and Characters," &c. New York : D. Appleton & Company.—1855.

Grace Lee. By Julia Kavanagh : author of "Daisy Burns," "Madeleine," "Nathalie," "Women of Christianity." By the same publishers.

My Brother's Keeper. By A. B. Warner, author of "Dollars and Cents," "Mr. Rutherford's Children," &c. Same Publishers.

THE first of these is a very serious book, designed to show that religious professions growing out of fervid emotions and sudden enthusiasm, have no value or stability, unless the only true basis of christian character, deep convictions, a solemn sense of duty, and persevering prayer, be sought and found. The second, a brilliant and powerful production, exposes the hollowness and emptiness of the world, the vanity of its customs, its pomp and parade, and the unsatisfactory nature of its possessions and enjoyments, without a religious character. The third is a charming volume, breathing throughout the spirit of genuine piety, and illustrating the power for good exerted by the unwavering consistency and the loveliness of the christian character of an affectionate sister over a wayward and worldly-minded brother. A most wholesome and excellent book.

WE announce the reception, too late for particular notice in our present number, of the first volume of Lamartine's History of Turkey, and of Huc's intensely interesting narrative of a "Journey through the Chinese Empire." They will receive due attention as soon as we shall be able to resume the critic's chair and pen.

Signs of the Times ; or, Present, Past, and Future. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D., F. R. S. E. Author of *Lectures on the Apocalypse, Miracles, Daniel, Parables, &c.* "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars, and upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston.—1855.

THE productions of Dr. Cumming are so equal in merit, that having frequently expressed our opinion concerning them, it seems hardly to be necessary to reiterate what has been frequently said. We have found the signs of the times as readable as his former publications, perhaps to some they may be more attractive than others, because they deal with that future into which so many are anxious to look, and all must believe is about to develop great and startling events. The table of contents, will indicate the entertainment that is to be expected :

1. The signs of the times.
2. The Moslem, and his end.
3. The Christian and his hope.
4. The Jew, his ruin and his restoration.
5. Noah, his age and ours.
6. Signs, celestial and terrestrial.
7. The desire of all nations.
8. The final destiny.
9. It is done.
10. The Lord reigneth.

Family Prayers for each Morning and Evening in the Year. With references to appropriate Scripture Readings. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D. Author of *Lectures On the Apocalypse, Miracles, Parables, Daniel. &c.* "Teach us to pray." Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston.—1855.

THE plan of this work is to furnish a prayer for every morning and evening in the year. In addition, it points out suitable portions of the word of God to be read in family worship. The selections are made both from the Old Testament and the New. The author's preface is as follows : "The prayers in these volumes, and their arrangement, have occupied the spare hours of the author's very busy life for four years. They have one excellence in their structure—they are as simple as Saxon phraseology would enable him to make them, and he trusts as scriptural, evangelical and protestant as any. They are suited, by the generality and simplicity of the prayers, for every class and type in this busy world. With earnest hearts to feel and use them, and the teaching of God's Holy Spirit, these prayers may become instinct with life, and unload many a full soul that cannot strike out words for itself. The scripture references will be found very useful in selecting such portions of the Holy Ghost as may be read in connection with the prayers. That it may please God abundantly to bless, to the edification of his church and the glory of his name, these volumes, is the author's earnest prayer, through Christ Jesus."

The Acts of the Apostles; or, the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. By M. Baumgarten, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, and Professor in the University of Rostock. Translated from the German, by the Rev. A. J. W. Morrison, Curate of Little Wittenham, Berks; Translator of Ritter's History of Philosophy; Guericke's Manual of Ecclesiastical Antiquities, &c. Three vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street.—1854. For sale by Smith and English, Philadelphia.

To those acquainted with the author of this work, his name would pledge something of value. He is not unknown to our theological public. The fact of so early a translation leads to high expectation. In either, or in both ways, prepared to expect much from the perusal, disappointment will not follow.

It is truly a history, or commentary, or both, of great value, and will amply reward those who study it.

Infidelity and frivolity, in their attacks upon this portion of the Word of God, appear likely to remove the complaint which was made by Chrysostom, "of the neglect of the Acts of the Apostles.

It has attracted the attention of distinguished divines in Germany of the orthodox school, and amongst these the author of this work holds a conspicuous place. Ample notice is taken of the heresies of the Tübingen school, as well as the softenings of other more orthodox. In what light it is viewed in Germany, by the most competent critics, may be seen in the words of Guericke, in his notice of it. "It is long since a work has appeared, which so fully accords with my views and feelings." He speaks of it as making an epoch, as exceedingly able, as breathing the finest spirit of christianity, as elaborated with the most comprehensive science. See *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche*. Vierzehnter Jahrgang.—1853. page 309.

Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity delivered in Philadelphia. By Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the fall and winter of 1853—4. With an Introductory Essay by Alonzo Potter, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Company.—1855. pp. 408.

THIS volume consists of a series of interesting discourses by distinguished Episcopal divines, on various topics of Christian evidence, with particular reference to the present aspects of Infidelity. The discussions are designed to relieve the difficulties of the thoughtful, who are in danger of being infected with that specious scepticism which shelters itself under the absurd names of science and philosophy. We regard the work as a valuable contribution to a branch of theological literature, to which additions must, from time to time, be made, in order that our evidences of revealed religion may be adapted to the actual wants of the age. Plausible objections are continually

springing up under the pretended auspices of physical science and metaphysical philosophy, which the Christian ought to be competent to meet. He is under obligation "by doctrine and by life," to refute all erroneous and strange teaching contrary to God's word.

The Introductory Essay by Bishop Potter, is marked by preëminent ability, and is worthy of the high reputation which he enjoys as a scholar. A brief view is given of the problem of Apologetics, which, according to the writer, involves both a practical and a speculative question. The subject is discussed with great learning and skill, and enforced with the author's characteristic vigor and elegance of expression. Our readers will be interested in the following passage respecting a recent publication which has attracted some attention: "We must confess that we have never, in the whole extent of our reading, met anything which is so offensive to good taste and the first principles of inductive philosophy, as the elaborate work recently given to the world under the title of *Types of Mankind*. Written under the influence of avowed prejudices against certain races of men, and descending to the use of caricature in order to bring them into disrepute, it stops at hardly any thing which can cast reproach on scripture. No jests are too coarse, no revilings too bitter or contemptuous, no special pleading too perverse. It is too mournful to find that such names as those of Morton and Agassiz are destined to go down to posterity, associated with such unseemly exhibitions of spite and intolerance. A cenotaph to Morton, one of the calmest and most dignified philosophers that any age or country has seen, should be stained by no scurrility, defamed by no violence. It is an insult to his memory to suppose that he could have desired his unpublished writings to be given to the world, in close connexion with an attack on the Bible, the malevolence of which is only equalled by its impotence."

The mechanical execution of the book is elegant. The bold clear type, and beautiful paper, render it very attractive to the eye, and a pleasure to peruse. The work is an ornament to the American press, and reflects great honor upon the house whence it emanated.

Pictorial History of the United States. By Samuel G. Goodrich. One vol. 12mo., pp. 360. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Co.

Pictorial History of England, Scotland, and Ireland. By Samuel G. Goodrich. pp. 444. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Co.

Pictorial History of Ancient Rome, with a sketch of the History of modern Italy. By Samuel G. Goodrich. pp. 333. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Co.

Pictorial History of Greece, Ancient and Modern. By Samuel G. Goodrich. pp. 333. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Co.

Pictorial History of France, for the use of Schools. By Samuel G. Goodrich. pp. 347. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Co.

Parley's Goodrich's Common School History. A brief Compend of Universal History. pp. 309. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Co.

THESE histories have received the approbation of leading men, and have been introduced into the principal seminaries of learning in the country. The excellence of the series has been fully tested by experience. All who have examined the volumes regard them as an important contribution to the means of popular education. They have been prepared with great care and tact, and are adapted to the instruction and improvement of the young. They are written in a lively and pleasing style, abounding in illustrations, anecdotes, incidents and descriptions, the histories in all cases being based on Geography, illustrated by maps. The works are freely supplied with engravings, giving correct ideas of manners and customs, views of cities, monuments, battles, &c. The whole series may justly challenge a comparison with any similar publications, and may be most cordially commended to public attention.

Visits to European Celebrities. By William B. Sprague, D. D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. New York: Sheldon, Lamport and Blakeman.—1855. pp. 305.

ON two different occasions Dr. Sprague visited the continent of Europe and Great Britain. During both visits he tells us he was more interested to see men than things, and to secure this gratification, he frequently travelled out of his route. The volume before us contains interesting reminiscences of many distinguished individuals whom he met. The sketches are exceedingly graphic, and altogether worthy of the graceful pen of their able author. The perusal of the book has afforded us very great pleasure. We found, indeed, a difficulty in laying it aside, until we reached the last page. It seemed as if we were in the presence of the persons described, sitting by their side, enjoying their conversation and drinking in their words, catching the spirit of the good and the wise. Strong points in their character are brought forth, striking anecdotes related, interesting incidents given, the inner life is revealed, and a distinct and clear impression of each is left upon the mind. A vast amount of information is presented, and many useful facts are introduced, not easily accessible. Dr. Sprague deserves our thanks for the service he has rendered. His work, too, he has done so well. There is nothing in bad taste, nothing to which the most fastidious could take exception. The task was a delicate one, but no one in the country could have executed it so satisfactorily. There is a *fac-simile* of the handwriting of each person noticed, which gives additional value to the work. We commend these sketches to all our readers, who are interested in the great and the learned, and who desire to be furnished with a rich entertainment.

Lectures on English Literature, from Chaucer to Tennyson. By Henry Reed, LL. D. Philadelphia: Parry and McMillan.—1855. pp. 411.

THERE is a mournful interest connected with the author of the volume before us. He was one of the unfortunate victims, who perished last September in the Arctic. After a most delightful sojourn abroad, when almost in sight of his native land, he sank beneath the waves of the ocean. For twenty-three years Professor Reed was connected with the instruction of the University of Pennsylvania, and during the whole period was distinguished for his fidelity and efficiency. He had a high reputation as a teacher, and always possessed a strong hold upon the affections of his pupils. He was an honor to the institution, with which he was so long identified. His continued and habitual devotion to study, his ripe and accomplished scholarship, his refined taste and gentle nature, his elevated purity of heart and purpose had won many friends and secured admirers for him on both sides of the Atlantic. We have read with much interest the *Lectures on English Literature*. They were originally delivered in the Chapel Hall, and were prepared by the author, without any idea of publication, in the hope of doing some service in connexion with English literature. They are written in a popular, though elegant style, and are designed to furnish useful hints and suggestions with regard to the reading of English authors. The lectures do not profess to be profound disquisitions, yet they abound in criticism the most judicious and with thoughts exceedingly valuable. No student of our language can read them without pleasure and profit. We are confident the volume will be received with favor by the literary public, and we hope the series, so auspiciously begun, will be succeeded by the publication of other manuscripts still in the possession of the family. We shall also be glad to see a memoir of Professor Reed, together with his correspondence, prepared for the press. The editor has done his part well. The notes are illustrative and explanatory, and give additional value to the work. A very correct and beautiful engraved portrait accompanies the volume, which will prove a source of much gratification to the numerous pupils and other friends of the lamented Professor.

Lutheran Manual on Scripture Principles; or, the Augsburg Confession illustrated and sustained, chiefly by Scripture, and proofs and extracts from standard Lutheran Theologians of Europe and America; together with the Formula of Government and Discipline adopted by the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, Gettysburg, Pa. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston.—1855. pp. 352.

THE design of this work is to present, in a convenient form, the venerable symbol of our church with scripture proofs printed in full, and illustrative of the doctrines and duties taught. In the discussion of the subject, extracts

are given from the writings of the most eminent Lutherans of Europe since the Reformation, as well as from some of our earlier divines in this country. On the few points in the Confession, in which a difference of sentiments has prevailed among us, each party is permitted to speak for itself. Whilst the author's well known theological views are clearly and distinctly exhibited, the opinions of those who differ from him are treated with respect; there is every disposition manifested to give the other side of the question a fair and candid hearing. The Augsburg Confession is presented entire, in English and Latin throughout the work, and the German copy is appended, so as to furnish ample material for the study of this valuable document. The formula of government and discipline adopted by our General Synod, with scripture proofs, succeeds the discussion of the symbol; the volume thus forming altogether a most convenient *manual*, not only for the members of our own communion, but for Christians of other denominations who so frequently evince the most palpable ignorance respecting the doctrines and practices of the Lutheran church.

We have examined the work of Dr. Schmucker with much satisfaction. It is a seasonable production. We are pleased with its plan and its spirit. Its execution is able and judicious, adapted to the object intended, and worthy of the reputation which the author enjoys. The same excellences which characterize the other productions of his pen, distinguish the present work. It gives us pleasure to commend the volume to the favorable attention of the public, with confidence that it will be found useful for reference, and in the hope that its circulation may be as wide as its merits are deserving.

The mechanical execution of the work is very fine. It is printed with all the accuracy and neatness, which mark the publications of Lindsay and Blakiston.

Martin Behaim, the German Astronomer and Cosmographer of the times of Columbus: being the tenth Annual Discourse before the Maryland Historical Society, January 25th, 1855. By John G. Morris, D. D., Baltimore. Printed for the Maryland Historical Society: John Murphy and Co.—1855. pp. 48.

THE design of the discourse before us is, to rescue from undeserved oblivion the memory of an individual who was distinguished in his day, but who at the present time is comparatively unknown. Martin Behaim was cotemporary with the discovery of this continent, and was the intimate companion and associate of Columbus in his labors. He enjoyed a high reputation as a navigator, and was far in advance of most men of his generation, in his astronomical and geographical knowledge. Whilst he is not entitled to the distinction of having discovered America, ascribed to him by some, but which he never claimed, yet by his superior skill in the preparation of nautical instruments and charts, he contributed much to the magnificent geographical discoveries of that adventurous age. He was born at Nurnburg in 1459, and educated in the best schools. He was for a time the pupil of the celebrated Regiomontanus. His parents designed him for the pursuit of trade, but his aspirations were directed to subjects of higher intellectual in-

terest. From the counting-room he would go to his astronomical studies, impatient for the hour of release from what he regarded as the drudgery of business. His leisure moments were devoted to severe intellectual toil. His heart was in his favorite pursuit. And although he continued in business from necessity for a season, he relinquished it for his congenial studies, as soon as an opportunity offered. To these the greater part of his subsequent life was earnestly devoted. He died in Lisbon in 1506.

The sketch of this wonderful man is admirably presented by Dr. Morris. The discourse furnishes a vivid picture, not only of the hero himself, but also of the important period and those thrilling scenes, with which he was so intimately connected. It is full of interesting facts, which will be new to most persons, expressed in clear and forcible language, and with that agreeable and racy manner, which characterizes the most of the author's productions. We have read the discourse with much gratification, and we are sure its perusal will amply repay the reader. We incidentally learned that a leading *Review* of the country offered the Doctor fifty dollars for the matter; the offer was, however, rejected, as the article was regarded as the property of the Association, at whose request it was prepared.

The following passage from the discourse will be read with interest: "Germany for ages, has been the birth place of genius. Her history is full of heroic deeds in every department of human effort. It is the land of science, of art, of arms and of song. The preëminence of Germany in the highest grades of intellectual exertion, and her amazing progress in every art that can ennoble mankind, have elicited the applause of all who can be charmed by poetry, or instructed by philosophy. Though other lands have produced a more brilliant array of great navigators and discoverers of unknown countries, yet it is not the mere mariner or commander of an expedition, who deserves the entire credit of discoveries. It is true, he incurs the risk, he endures the labor, he suffers the exposure and has the honor of first seeing the long sought for land, but it is the astronomer on board mapping the heavens, the geographer drawing his charts, the meteorologist observing the temperature, the hydrographer watching the tides, the artizan making and manipulating the nautical instruments, the philosopher studying all the phenomena occurring in nature—it is he who eminently deserves a large share of the honors of discovery, for it is by the aid of his labors that the mariner is led to his brilliant results. Many a splendid geographical discovery has been made at sea, by the help of mathematical and artistic labor executed ashore. It was German astronomers, who by their calculations and tables, enabled the seafaring nations of that day to accomplish many of their brilliant exploits in the field of geographical discovery. Behaim was mariner, astronomer, geographer, artist and philosopher, all combined, and was publicly acknowledged by the Emperor Maximilian, to be the most extensively travelled citizen of the German empire."

The Salzburgers and their descendants: Being the history of a Colony of German Lutheran Protestants, who emigrated to Georgia in 1734, and settled at Ebenezer, twenty-five miles above the city of Savannah. By Rev. P. A. Strobel, of the South Car-

olina Synod, and Principal of the Female Institute, Americus, Ga. Baltimore: Published by T. Newton Kurtz.—1855. pp. 308.

THIS is a most acceptable addition to our church literature, and the author is entitled to our thanks for the important service he has performed. It is a publication which ought to be in every Lutheran family, and we sincerely trust that the author's effort to rescue the Salzburgers from the obscurity into which they had been permitted to fall, may meet with the encouragement which it deserves. We have found the volume exceedingly interesting, and take pleasure in commending it to the attention of the christian public—not only to our own members, but to christians of different denominations, who are interested in the history of God's people, satisfied that they will be amply rewarded by its perusal. The work contains an engraved portrait of Rev. J. M. Bolzius, first minister of the Salzburg congregation at Ebenezer in Georgia, also a neat cut of the Jerusalem church, Ebenezer, Ga., erected in 1767.

Much has been said in praise of the Pilgrim Fathers, who were driven from their homes in consequence of their attachment to the gospel, yet in ardent piety, christian heroism, and energetic devotion to the principles they professed, our own Salzburgers will compare most favorably with them. The prevalence of the German language among them, and the preservation of their records in their native tongue, have deprived them of the position in the annals of our country, to which their trials and virtues justly give them claim. The Salzburgers left their native land for conscience sake. Abandoning the endearments and comforts of home, they came to this Western wilderness, as it then was, that they might worship God without fear and molestation. They were willing to suffer imprisonment, exile, and even death, rather than surrender their religious principles which were so dear to them, and upon which they based all their hopes of future happiness. Their history presents a most beautiful example of patient endurance and christian zeal in the cause of the Redeemer, worthy of our imitation.

Memoir of Catharine E. Alleman, wife of Rev. M. J. Alleman, of Aaronsburg, Pa. By one who knew and loved her well. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz.—1855. pp. 131.

THE subject of the volume before us was the wife of a Lutheran clergyman, a woman of rare excellence, and eminent piety, who in early life was brought under the influence of Divine truth, and became an active christian. It seems to be a faithful record of one who sincerely served the Lord, and was always ready for "every good word and work." She exemplified, in her daily conduct, the reality and beauty of religion, and evinced a deep interest in the cause of the Redeemer. The book is interesting and instructive. It ought to circulate through the church, and find a place in our Sunday School Libraries. It is a disgrace to us, that our own publications are not more encouraged. Many of them will compare very favorably with works issued from the press by other denominations; all of them may be read with interest and profit. Our friend T. Newton Kurtz deserves the thanks of the

church for the care and taste which he displays in getting up his publications, and we hope he may meet with the encouragement from the church which his efforts merit.

An Address delivered before the Linnean Association of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Sept. 20th, 1854. By Hon. Samuel Hepburn, of Carlisle, Pa.—pp. 22.

JUDGE Hepburn's address, when delivered, attracted the marked favor and cordial approval of a large and much gratified auditory, and we regard it as in every respect deserving the high commendation which it, at the time, elicited. The object of the address is to exhibit the responsibilities of educated men to their country, and the way in which these responsibilities may be met. The impressive thoughts are presented with power, and expressed in appropriate language.

A Discourse to the Graduating Class of Pennsylvania College, Sept. 17th 1854. By H. L. Baugher, D. D.—pp. 16.

THE Apostolic injunction, *Quit you like men*, is the text selected for discussion in the Baccalaureate of President Baugher, and after some reference to the characteristics of the times, the author tells what kind of men are needed for the occasion. We want men deeply imbued with the spirit of Christ; men who will carry forward the life of this country, in the development of its vast physical, intellectual and moral resources; men of industry, patience, perseverance, self-reliance and faith, having for their motto *Excelsior*. All these points are discussed with ability and earnestness. The sentiments inculcated are important; they should be carefully pondered by the young men of the day, and put into practice.

Address delivered at the laying of the Corner-Stone of the Shamokin Institute, August 2nd, 1854. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D.—pp. 17.

THIS is also an interesting address on the subject of education. It abounds in useful information and valuable truth, expressed in the writer's usual lucid and felicitous style. The views presented are worthy the consideration of all who feel an interest in the subject of education.

Address on Education, delivered in the Court House at Sunbury, Pa., November 6th, 1854. By Rev. John J. Reimensnyder.—pp. 18.

THIS is a most sensible discourse on a very important subject, and deserves to be extensively circulated. Although the theme is hackneyed, there is a freshness in the discussion which is not always met with in such addresses. The pleasures, as well as the advantages derived from study, are discussed with conciseness, yet with much force. The writer also notices various defects in our system of Common School Education, and suggests appropriate improvements.

CONTRIBUTORS.

The following individuals have written articles for the pages of the Evangelical Review, and we are encouraged to expect additional contributions from them, as well as from others, who have promised us their assistance and co-operation :

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| W. M. Reynolds, D. D. | Rev. J. N. Hoffman, A. M. |
| H. L. Baugher, D. D. | C. W. Schaeffer, D. D. |
| C. F. Schaeffer, D. D. | Prof. H. W. Thorpe, A. M. |
| H. I. Schmidt, D. D. | Rev. B. Sadtler, A. M. |
| J. G. Morris, D. D. | G. A. Lintner, D. D. |
| Rev. C. Porterfield Krauth, A. M. | Rev. C. Walker, A. M. |
| " J. A. Seiss, A. M. | Prof. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M. |
| C. P. Krauth, D. D. | Rev. H. Ziegler, A. M. |
| B. Kurtz, D. D. | " M. Loy, |
| Rev. J. Few Smith, A. M. | Prof. A. T. Bievent, |
| S. W. Harkey, D. D. | Rev. J. Oswald, A. M. |
| Prof. M. Jacobs, A. M. | Prof. D. Worley, A. M. |
| J. W. Richards, D. D.* | Rev. J. L. Schock, A. M. |
| Prof. M. L. Stoever, A. M. | " J. A. Brown, A. M. |
| G. B. Miller, D. D. | " W. J. Mann, A. M. |
| T. Stork, D. D. | " P. Rizer, A. M. |
| H. Mills, D. D. | D. F. Bittle, D. D. |
| Rev. B. M. Schmucker, A. M. | Prof. F. Springer, A. M. |
| " G. Diehl, A. M. | Rev. E. Miller, A. M. |
| " E. Greenwald, | " B. Appleby, |
| L. Eichelberger, D. D. | " M. Valentine, A. M. |
| S. S. Schmucker, D. D. | " F. R. Anspach, A. M. |

*Deceased.